The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1889.

The Week.

THE popular verdicts against prohibition have been coming with cumulative force for two years now, no less than eight States having rejected it by steadily increasing majorities. Pennsylvania closed the list on Tuesday with the crushing adverse majority of 185,000. As a culmination of the series came the decision in Rhode Island on Thursday to repeal an amendment which had been in operation for three years, both the vote in favor of repeal being greatly in excess of the necessary three-fifths of the whole, and the vote in favor of retaining the amendment being one-third smaller than that cast for its adoption three years ago. There can be no question as to the meaning of this decision. Prohibition, which had been put on trial by popular vote, has been found to be a failure in practice, and has been condemned. That the Rhode Island law has been not only a complete failure, but a most pernicious influence, cannot be questioned. When it was first put in operation in 1886, there was for a time a perceptible decrease in open liquor-selling, and also in drunkenness, but it was only for a short time. The liquor-dealers soon found that they could sell without much danger of interference by taking slight precautions, and within six months their business has not only returned to its former proportions under license, but has actually exceeded them. Figures given out by the prohibition advocates themselves during the recent campaign prove this. They published a table, which for some inscrutable reason they supposed sustained their case, giving the commitments to the House of Correction, to the State Prison, and for common drunkenness, as they were recorded under license and under prohibition. From these it appeared that during the last year under prohibition there had been precisely the same number of common drunkards as there had been in the last year under license; that the number of commitments to the House of Correction had been 521 during the last year of prohibition, against 498 during the last year under license; and that the commitments to State Prison during the last year under prohibition had been 69, against 53 under license.

The secret-ballot law which has been passed by both houses of the Connecticut Legislature is in no sense an application of the Australian system. It provides for a secret ballot, and forbids any ticket-peddlers to approach within 100 feet of the polls. These are important advances in the direction of honest elections. They are similar to those of the Milwaukee law, which worked so well in practice that the Wisconsin Legislature was convinced of the wisdom of adopting the Australian system and applying it to the whole State. In other respects the new Connecticut bill is not of great consequence. There is little to be gained by having the State furnish the paper for the official ballots, so long as the political organizations are to have charge of the printing and distribution of them. The envelope provision is of no apparent consequence one way or another. It was tried in Louisville and was pronounced unnecessary and confusing. It is a curious spectacle to see the Connecticut politicians who are so alarmed about the complications of the Australian system, taking up the very part of that system which has been tried and rejected because it makes complication.

The promoters of ballot reform in Massachusetts have taken a wise step in forming a Ballot-Act League for the special purpose of securing an effective operation of the new law when it receives its first trial at the election next fall. They have made a thorough organization, with Elihu B. Hayes of Lynn for President, Richard H. Dana of Cambridge for Treasurer, and Josiah Quincy of Quincy for Secretary. The League is entirely non-partisan in its character, and its list of officers contains the names of prominent members of all political parties. All persons interested in the objects of the League are invited to become members. Names should be sent to Albert C. Burrage, Assistant Secretary, 8 Congress Street, room 10, Boston. The admission fee of one dollar may be sent either to the same address or to Richard H. Dana, Treasurer, 30 Court Street, Boston. The League invites correspondence from city and town officials and others, and will endeavor to furnish all possible information on matters covered by the law. All such correspondence should be addressed to the office of the Assistant Secretary, as above. Several committees have been appointed, and are already engaged upon such branches of the work in hand as the following: (1) on preparation of forms under the act (nominations, etc.); (2) on preparation of plans, specifications, etc., for polling arrangements; (3) on preparation of information to election officers, political committees, and the general public; (4) on distribution of printed matter; (5) on procuring appointment of competent election officers; (6) on membership and branches; and (7) on finance. The idea of the League is as admirable as it is necessary, and should be adopted in the seven other States which have similar ballot laws. The Secretary of State, in Massachusetts, and Mayor Hart of Boston have promised their coöperation in the work there, and we have no doubt that State and city officials in other localities would do the same. It would give the politicians everywhere great joy to see the new system fail, or prove cumbersome on first trial, and they will do all they can to impede its working. For that reason its friends should be on the alert.

Gov. Bulkeley of Connecticut is said to have been greatly disturbed by the coupling of his name with Gov. Hill's, owing to the similarity of the views of both concerning the best way of reforming election methods. If this be so, Gov. Hill has no intention of helping him to cut loose from the companionship, for he has hastened to assure a reporter of his Albany organ that the new Secret-Ballot Bill which the Connecticut Legislature has passed and Gov. Bulkeley has signed, is "in substance the Linson bill," which Gov. Hill himself recommended the New York Legislature to pass in preference to the Saxton bill. He declares that he would have signed such a measure with pleasure, and shall recommend a similar one to the New York Legislature next year. This is the most unfavorable criticism which has yet been made upon the Connecticut bill, and it leaves Gov. Bulkeley and Gov. Hill more firmly coupled than before. A fresh bond of union is also furnished by the former's determination not to sign a high-license bill which the Connecticut Legislature passed.

An amusing light is thrown upon the character of Gov. Hill's deliberative methods with legislative bills by the discovery that two which he finally vetoed were first approved and signed, and the signature subsequently removed by the use of acids. The acid did its work pretty well, but it left traces, which, being closely examined, read: "Approved, June 15, 1889. David B. Hill." One of the bills which were thus decided upon in two ways was the Capitol Appropriation Bill, and the other provided for the appointment of six female factory inspectors. The question is raised by the friends of these measures as to the date of the erasure, the contention being that unless the approval was erased before the end of the thirty days' limit for considering bills, both measures became laws and could not be vetoed by the Governor. There is a suggestion that the Governor be put under oath and made to give the date upon which he executed formally his change of mind, but this will probably not be attempted. It would be interesting, however, to know the exact nature of the reasons which decided his final action.

The full reports of the proceedings in the Indianapolis Post-office investigation add many interesting points to the telegraphic summaries, and make more plain the cause for the bitterness which Postmaster Wallace and the other Republican spoilsmen now manifest against Mr. Roosevelt. On the morning of the investigation the Indianapolis *Sentinel*, the leading Democratic newspaper in the State, published prominently on its first page, under the heading "Some Valuable Pointers for the Civil-Service Commission," brief biographies of the rascals appointed in the office, like this:

CHARLES F. MOORE.—Moore was in office under Postmaster Jones; ran a gambling-room in the Talbott-New block; was arrested and fined therefor and incontinently fired. Reinstated by Postmaster Wallace.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the Commissioners opened their session, the Republicans present were shocked to see Mr. Roosevelt, a Republican, holding in his hand this dreadful Democratic sheet, and simply horrified when he accepted it as good authority and asked if what it said was true. The spoilsmen hemmed and hawed over the injustice of convicting a man on newspaper reports, but finally admitted that the *Sentinel's* statement was correct, and were promptly told that "Moore's reinstatement was null and void."

Later in the proceedings the spoilsmen made another atempt to discredit the *Sentinel*, but it was of no avail. Said Mr. Roosevelt:

"Since the gentleman complains of our treating him badly, I shall state frankly that the fault is all his own. The history of this Post-office since Mr. Wallace came into possession of it, has been such as to convince any one knowing the facts that politics had ruled the appointing power. It is useless to discuss the matter; the men cannot remain in the service another day longer. This decision may serve to prevent a recurrence of what has undoubtedly already transpired. We have been inclined to think that these violations of the law have been made as the result of ignorance and lack of familiarity with the law, and have been inclined to be lenient on that account. But this instance makes it appear as if they were malicious. As to the course of newspapers, that is their business. They would be derelict in their duty to the public did they not expose illegal acts in the public service."

Finally, to cap the climax, the *Sentinel*, that odious Democratic paper, on the morning after the investigation, bestowed the heartiest praise upon Mr. Roosevelt, saying: "Theodore Roosevelt, who, in the main, conducted the examination, manifested much skill, clearness, and independence. As a whole the Commission exhibited great earnestness and sincerity in its work. Its visit, though too long delayed, may yet have the effect of redeeming the office from the crowd of ward heelers who were rapidly gaining undisputed sway over it."

A recent special to the Boston *Herald* represents the President as much disturbed by the public criticism on his Sunday jaunts. He says:

"Don't you think they are utterly unreasonable? As you know, no one is more solicitous for the proper observance of Sunday than I am, and no one would be more scrupulous about his own conduct in this respect than I have been; yet these newspapers are trying to make people believe that I have suddenly become grossly inconsistent in this regard. They know just how it is. They know that I have no other time for rest, and they know that I must rest if I am to keep on with my work."

But the people do not want President Harrison to "keep on with his work"—that is, the sort of work he has been keeping on with. So far as the President specially needs rest, it is because of his pernicious activity in the loot of the civil service, and of his contentions with the horde of office-seekers whom he invited from the first in his inaugural address, and continues to encourage by making vacant places for them. His "work," so far as it is peculiarly fatiguing, is such that he and the country would be much better off if he were to abandon it. And it is not merely injurious, but it is self-imposed.

The State of Connecticut has adopted a new method of collecting taxes on intangible and invisible personal property, such as bonds, promissory notes, and choses in action. Hitherto it has been incumbent on the owners of such property to list the same for taxation, and to swear to the correctness of the list. Only the more conscientious taxpayers complied with the law, and it would seem that this class was growing smaller or poorer from year to year, since the amount of such property listed is growing less and less. The new law provides that the owner of any property of this description may present it to the State Treasurer, and, by paying a tax of 1 per cent. on its face value, have it stamped free of all other taxation for five years, or at the same rate for any greater or less period—*i. e.*, at the rate of two mills per annum. The operation of this law will be awaited with interest. It will be interesting to see, in the first place, how many people will come to the front and acknowledge that they have been cheating the State and swearing falsely in the past. In the way of easing consciences, the act might prove efficacious if it did not tend to expose past offences. But it is not quite certain that people who have been withholding a tax of four or five mills on the dollar heretofore will now purchase the easing of their consciences by a payment of two mills. We quite agree with the Hartford *Courant* that "there are some queer features about the way it will work." The last Tax Commission of the State recommended that this kind of property be exempted altogether on account of the difficulties and inequalities of collection. Probably the Legislature eased its own conscience by adopting this half-way measure. The tax on this kind of property in Pennsylvania is only three mills per annum, and the methods of collection are much more drastic than in Connecticut; but the Auditor-General of the former State, in his report for 1886, said that not more than one-half of the property subject to the tax was got hold of.

The annual report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for Illinois for the current year is chiefly concerned with the subject of mortgage indebtedness. Statistics showing the state of such indebtedness in the years 1870, 1880, and 1887 are presented, together with such evidence as could be obtained as to the actual value of farming lands in the State. Leaving town and city lots and the suburban lands of Chicago out of the account, the mortgages on all other lands run as follows:

Year.	
1870	$95,721,003
1880	103,525,237
1887	123,733,098

Separating as far as possible mortgages representing deferred payments of purchase-money, from loans, the Commissioners think that the mortgage indebtedness of farmers for borrowed money has increased 23 per cent. since 1880, and that this is more than twice the ratio of increase in the value of the farm lands. An increase in land values is reported in 25 counties, a decrease in 20 counties, while in 16 the values have remained unchanged.

The *American Wool Reporter* rebukes the New York *Press* for its jesuitical statement that the free-traders are trying to stir up trouble between the wool-growers and the woollen manufacturers. The truth of the matter is (says the *Wool Reporter*) that there are very positive differences between the wool and woollen interests, and that the free-traders, although glad to chronicle them, did not originate them. "The very lowest possible compromise," it continues, "between the low-tariff and high-tariff elements in the wool interests at present will consist in substituting ad-valorem for specific duties on wool." This is flat, but the flatness of it is not fully apparent unless we recall what the wool-growers are aiming at, and what they succeeded in accomplishing in the Senate after the election of Harrison. The Senate Tariff Bill, as originally reported, fixed the duties on carpet-wool costing 12 cents or less per pound at 2½ cents per pound, and on the same costing more than 12 cents at 6 cents per pound. When Congress reconvened after the election, the Finance Committee reported amendments raising the former duty to 4 cents and the latter to 8 cents — the existing rates being 2½ and 5 cents respectively. The importation of carpet-wools amounted to 82,000,000 pounds in 1887, while that of all other wools was only 33,000,000 pounds. Now, it is not likely that manufacturers will consent to any bill which, while substituting ad-valorem for specific rates, nearly doubles the rate of duty on this grade of wool. Nor is it probable that the wool-growers will consent to a change from specific to ad-valorem unless they get the increase they asked for, and which the Senate conceded to them only six months ago. It is a very hopeful quarrel, and the free-traders are not only glad to chronicle it, although they did not originate it, but they will help to promote it in every possible way.

The final decision of the Civil District Court in New Orleans against the Cotton-Oil Trust is the most important item in the news of the day. The Trust is adjudged guilty of usurping, intruding into, and unlawfully holding and exercising the franchises and privileges of a corporation without being duly incorporated, and is for ever excluded and debarred from the said franchises and privileges within the State, and declared to be an illegal and invalid association, and defendants are condemned to pay all costs. This is the result of two or three years' litigation. It is probably a surprise to the majority of the legal profession, just as the decision of the Supreme Court in the Illinois Warehouse case was a surprise. There is every reason, however, to believe that it will be sustained by the higher courts and by the courts of other States in analogous cases.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The election of Prof. E. B. Andrews to the Presidency of Brown University is an event of distinct importance to the cause of liberal learning in this country. In preferring him above many older and more conservative men who were proposed for the place, the trustees of the University have shown that they are in favor of the infusion of young blood and progressive ideas into the conduct of the college. Prof. Andrews was the favorite candidate of the younger alumni. He is still a young man himself, about forty-five years of age, and belongs to the class of writers and thinkers who place scholarship above all political influences and considerations, and who agree with Emerson that to the seeker after truth "nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind." He was graduated from Brown University in 1870, and then went to Newton Theological Seminary, where he was prepared for the ministry. He has preached somewhat, but has taught more since that time, and as a teacher has developed the invaluable gift of imparting enthusiasm to his pupils. When, about a year ago, he resigned the chair of History and Political Economy, which he had held for a short period at Brown, in order to accept a similar chair at Cornell, his loss to the former college was regarded as very serious, for he had already made himself not only a force in the life of the college, but a valued influence in the city of Providence. He not only entertains liberal ideas, but has the courage to express them. We need only recall his article on "Trusts according to Official Investigations," which he published in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* in January last, and which we commended at the time as a model of economic discussion.

The most important undertaking for the advancement of art in this country in many years is the forming of the American Fine Arts Society, which is primarily a coalition for business purposes of the Society of American Artists, the Architectural League, and the Art Students' League. These societies represent in their several directions the young and vigorous movement of American art in its best phase, and anything that tends to unite more closely their interests and influence is likely to be potent for good. The American Fine Arts Society is incorporated under the General Manufacturing Act, and its stock is to be taken by the three societies named or by their members or friends. Its purpose is to provide a building which shall contain permanent quarters for these societies and galleries for their exhibitions. Provision has been made also for the Society of Painters in Pastel and for the New York Art Guild, a business organization for the protection of artists in their dealings with exhibitions throughout the country. While none of these organizations is sufficiently rich to provide itself independently with permanent quarters, the sum they collectively spend in rentals is sufficient to maintain a large and handsome building for their joint use. The plan of the new organization for this purpose has been submitted to business men of the highest standing, and is pronounced thoroughly practical and feasible.

While the combination is thus beneficial from a business point of view, it is even more promising from the point of view of the dignity and influence of the several organizations concerned in it. They are largely identical in aim and interchangeable in membership. The Society of American Artists and the Architectural League have many members in common. The Society of Painters in Pastel is composed entirely of members of the Society of American Artists, and the latter Society furnishes all of the teachers in the schools of the Art Students' League and some of the members of that League. A closer union of all these bodies was therefore in every way desirable, and now that it is effected and that there is a prospect of obtaining a permanent habitation of their own, a career of incalculable usefulness seems open to them. In dignity and thoroughness of equipment the new organization should be second only, if even second, to the Academy of Design, while the absence of any limitation of the membership of the several societies will tend to keep it always a more liberal and progressive body than the latter. The life fellowships which the new Society has founded entitle the holder to five season tickets to each of the several exhibitions of the Society of American Artists, the Architectural League, and the Society of Painters in Pastel. The purchaser of a fellowship will thus find himself entitled to admission to three of the most interesting exhibitions of the year, while he can feel that his money is aiding the progress of art in America in the most efficacious way possible.

The resolution of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce in favor of the annexation or purchase of Lower California, together with the alleged intention of Senator Stanford to urge the matter in the next session of the Senate, has been taken rather more seriously than it deserves by the Mexicans. The Mexican Senate recently voted to call upon the Government for any information in its possession bearing on the matter. On May 30 Secretary Mariscal appeared before that body, in secret session, and detailed the attitude observed by the Administration in the affair. Of course his remarks are not given out for publication, but it is freely said by Senators that he completely satisfied them of the determination of President Diaz to uphold the national dignity and to maintain the integrity of the national territory. It would seem, from all accounts, that our Government had at least made some advances to Mexico to ask if any proposition from us in regard to Lower California would be considered; but this is by no means certain. At any rate, it is made evident that Mr. Blaine will have to look far afield for any strip of territory to spend the surplus in acquiring. Spain has declared almost defiantly that the United States have not money enough to buy Cuba, and now the Mexican Government affirms that the only way for us to get any more Mexican territory is to fight and beat the Mexican Army.

Peru appears to be about to fall into new troubles. The prolonged hitch over the ratification of the compact with the holders of Peruvian bonds has now given way to a political crisis of the sharpest kind. The Doughnomore contract failed of legal ratification, through the persistent absence from their seats of a number of members of the House of Deputies, who took that way of defeating a measure extremely obnoxious to them. President Cáceres has responded by a decree declaring the seats of these obstructionist deputies vacant. A cry of protest at once came up from the departments thus summarily deprived of representation. The reply of the President was the despatching of a body of troops to quell the rising discontent, and to arrest all those who had the temerity to sign memorials protesting against the action of the Executive. When Congress met recently, Government patrols were at the place of assemblage to keep out the offending members. More than this, they went so far as to exclude the President of Congress himself, Señor Arenas, who had not been mentioned in the decree of expulsion. He endeavored to assert his rights under the Constitution and the laws, but without avail. President Cáceres seems determined to carry his measures through with a high hand, and will have a submissive Congress or none at all. His excuse is, of course, that the prosperity of the country demands the speedy settlement of the long-standing dispute. This may be true; yet his methods are of a kind to produce worse evils than he aims to cure.

The reassembling of the Spanish Cortes, June 14, was in pursuance of a very shrewd plan on the part of Sagasta. To maintain party discipline and a peaceable procedure, it was absolutely essential to get the refractory President of the Chamber, Martos, out of the way. Yet he steadily refused to resign, and an effort to depose him would be of an uncertain result. Sagasta might, as we recently pointed out, have chosen not to call the Cortes together again at all; but he is naturally anxious to press on his financial measures, and get a chance to go to the country for the next general election, with the great advantage of at least having tried to pass the Universal-Suffrage Bill. What he did was to get the Queen Regent to declare the session of the Cortes, suspended by royal decree in the latter part of May, now closed, and to call that body together again for its last legal session. This was a neat way of putting Martos out of office, and his successor was easily elected, in the person of a strong friend of the Administration, as soon as the new session began. It is agreed on all hands that Sagasta has managed the affair most dexterously. His estimates are now being voted. After they are out of the way, he will throw the whole strength of the Administration in favor of the Suffrage Bill, and, whether he can carry it or not, it will be the principal plank in his platform for the next election.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROTATION AND THE PRESIDENCY.

Mr. F. W. Whitridge's interesting article on "Rotation in Office," in the current number of the *Political Science Quarterly*, exposes most satisfactorily a vast amount of humbug and cant in connection with the subject. Mr. Whitridge proves conclusively that when the founders of the Government talked about the necessity of rotation in office, they meant rotation in elective, not minor executive and administrative, offices. He cites not only Washington and Adams on this point, but Jefferson himself, in language which is perfectly clear and unmistakable. But these citations are, as he says, superfluous, because the practice of these early Presidents is a much more clear demonstration of their theory than any words could have been. There was no rotation in office in their time, except in elective offices. During the first forty years of the Government, "there were, outside of the Cabinet, only eighty-two removals from office," and "all of these removals were, or were alleged to be, for cause." It was not until forty years after the adoption of the Constitution, when the generation whose work it was had died, that Jackson, with that ferocious vulgarity which, as Bishop Potter has said, marked his ideas of politics, made the first "clean sweep." To justify it, the ingenuity of Van Buren, Marcy, and Silas Wright was called into play, and these statesmen for this purpose produced what they pretended was the old, but what was really the entirely new, theory of "rotation." Real Americans, they insisted, had always believed in rotation in office, cunningly perverting the use of the term from elective to administrative offices. Mr. Whitridge shows further the curious fact that these politicians got their teaching in government, not where they pretended to find it, in the school of Jefferson, but in the degraded politics of this State, where the old "council of appointment" had for more than forty years carried on the whole administration of the State on the spoils system. New Yorkers who sigh over the condition of the civil service at Washington, have food for reflection in the fact that it was from the festering corruption of their own State that the virus was transferred which has poisoned the whole body politic. So wholly unknown had the new kind of politics been in the Federal Government that, even as late as 1834, we find Madison expressing the childlike belief that the odium attaching to this abuse of patronage would be sufficient to restrain its exercise.

Mr. Whitridge, having disposed of the pretence that there is something peculiarly "democratic," or consonant with the spirit of our institutions, in "rotation," proceeds to discuss the statute of 1820, which has been one of the most efficient aids in popularizing the new system. This statute makes the terms of some four thousand officials, and those generally of high rank, come to an end in four years, instead of lasting during good behavior. Like so many other things connected with rotation in office, the statute was itself a sham. It was avowedly passed to secure a higher degree of accountability in these officers. It is plain enough that any employer who would expect to get more perfect accountability by telling his clerks that, faithful or not, no clerk could hold his place for more than four years, would be deemed a little cracked. Of course this was not the real reason. The real reason was, according to John Quincy Adams, to promote the election of W. H. Crawford as President of the United States in 1825: "It was drawn up by Mr. Crawford, as he himself told me. It was introduced into the Senate by Mahlon Dickerson of New Jersey, then one of his devoted partisans; and its design was to secure for Mr. Crawford the influence of all the incumbents in office, at the peril of displacement, and of five or ten times an equal number of ravenous office-seekers, eager to supplant them." What is more, the plan very nearly succeeded.

There were still a few of the earlier generation of statesmen lagging superfluous on the stage, and again, curiously enough, when we think how commonly the principle of rotation is supposed to be a doctrine of Jeffersonian Democracy, among the first to denounce the law was Jefferson himself. A few months after the passage of the act, he made the following remarkable prophecy, which entitles us to quote him as one of the most far-sighted of the enemies of the spoils system:

"It saps the constitutional and salutary functions of the President, and introduces a principle of intrigue and corruption which will soon leaven the mass not only of Senators, but of citizens. It is more baneful than the attempt, which failed in the beginning of the Government, to make all officers irremovable but with the consent of the Senate. This places, every four years, all appointments under their power, and even obliges them to act on any one nomination. It will keep in constant excitement all the hungry cormorants of office; render them, as well as those in place, sycophants to their Senators; engage these in eternal intrigue to turn out one and put in another, in cabals to swap work, and make of them [*i. e.*, the Senators] *what all executive directories become, mere sinks of corruption and faction.*"

Madison, to whom this was written, thought the law full of just this mischief, and, further, that it was an unconstitutional encroachment on the Executive. What the effect of the law has been, every one knows. Not only has it introduced a four-years' term in the principal executive offices, but has produced a custom and a way of thinking which has virtually made all offices four-year offices. Outside the judiciary, there is no such thing as tenure during good behavior in the United States.

It has been noticed that the object of the act was to give Crawford plenty of henchmen to help him to an election as President. It was actually used by Jackson to strengthen the Executive. The early effect of the "clean sweep" was to make the President a more powerful figure than he had hitherto been in the American system. Jackson made himself for the time being a kind of despot. By turning out officials who had no particular motive to help him, and filling their places with stanch personal adherents, he made the little civil service of his time a personal bodyguard, and was able to give effect to his own violent will in a way that had before seemed impossible. Accordingly, at first, the Senate itself revolted at the tyrannous abuse of Executive power it had authorized. In 1825 a select committee reported unanimously a bill to repeal the act, on the express ground that it gave the President too much power. In 1835 a repealing act passed the Senate by a vote of nearly two to one. Clay, Benton, Webster, Calhoun, Ewing, and Southard all insisted on the repeal of the act for the reasons we have mentioned, and which are more cogent now than they were then.

Mr. Whitridge's object is to expose the nature of the humbug which keeps alive the four-year principle, and to this he confines himself; but his article suggests much besides what it says—among other things, that one marked result of rotation has been to shift the seat of the abuse, since Jackson's time, exactly as Jefferson foresaw that it would, from the Executive to the Legislature. As the civil service grew in size, it became more and more difficult for the President to manage the "clean sweep" himself, or to put his own henchmen in every little post-office and marshalship. He soon found that he had to select his appointees from those recommended by the local party authorities, who were necessarily members of the House or Senate. As the Senate also had the confirming power, the control of the civil service soon began to slip away from the President. Of recent years every President at the outset of his term has been confronted with a problem which no President has yet solved. He has come into office with a desire to regain his constitutional control over appointments. He has been at once confronted by cabals or coalitions of managers, largely recruited from the Senate and House, determined to allow him to do nothing whatever, unless he sends in the names of appointees satisfactory to "the party"—*i. e.*, to themselves. In Grant's time they went so far that not only did Conkling absolutely direct whatever was to be done in New York, but a "Senatorial Group" made its appearance, which practically put the President's office into commission, and invented the third-term project, in order to introduce not a Presidential Cæsarism, but a species of Senatorial boss-rule, with poor Cæsar for a puppet. Nothing was more remarkable in Grant's career than his gradual reduction from the proportions of a popular hero waging war on politicians as the people's enemies, to that of an apparently brainless automaton, worked by a cabal of powerful political intriguers. Hayes made a feeble effort to assert his independence, but never was able to convince the world of it; Garfield was assassinated by a criminal whose crazy rage was excited by the spectacle of a President breaking away even a little from those who regarded themselves as his owners. Arthur, always doing what was easiest at the time, and never attempting much more than to trim his sails to the wind, did not allow the problem to trouble him.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finally Cleveland, who went into office with a sincere determination not only to reform the civil service, but to restore the President's authority over it, found that a great measure of control of the patronage by members of the Senate and House—that is, by "the party"—was the *sine qua non* of his being allowed to do anything in any other direction.

If these tendencies were to go on unchecked, we should ultimately have, as Jefferson foresaw, not an executive tyrant, but a poor miserable executive puppet, directed by the hands of a powerful Senatorial or legislative directory. Going on as we are, the time would come, and not be long in coming (it was actually threatened at the end of the last campaign), when a sort of permanent party committee on patronage would establish itself in Washington, consisting of such men as Quay and Platt, who would be the centre of all power—not only executive, but legislative.

From this fate there is no way in which the Presidency can be saved except the restoration of its constitutional prerogative through a tenure of administrative offices during good behavior. Mr. Harrison's plan of taking his nominations here from a State delegation, there from a Senatorial boss, and here from one faction, and there from another, may produce a fine state of intestine discord or party paralysis, but nothing more. The Presidency cannot be a real executive office as long as the civil service is in great measure controlled by the legislature, towards which Federal politics is drifting. The goal is what Jefferson was accustomed to think of as government by a directory—what we know as government by a ring.

FREEDOM OF THEOLOGICAL TEACHING.

When a man sets forth on the sea of religious controversy, he never can tell where he will fetch up, as the prolonged discussion between Prof. Huxley and his various antagonists in the *Nineteenth Century* clearly shows. The original issue must have been forgotten by the disputants themselves by this time, to say nothing of their readers. As often happens, too, a question not in sight when the controversy began, has come to have an importance and to awaken an interest greater than that of the primary dispute. Such seems to us the question of freedom in theological instruction broached in the discussion referred to. Prof. Huxley took occasion to remark that Germany and Holland were the only countries where professors of theology could feel free to "follow the argument," as Socrates used to say, unfettered by adhesion to certain conclusions beforehand. This was resented with considerable heat by Dr. Wace, who saw in it a charge of mercenary motives. Prof. Huxley thereupon disclaimed any personal imputation, but deliberately reaffirmed, after his manner as the great *malleus orthodoxorum*, that the system of binding instructors in theology to a creed was a bad one, tending at once to repress original investigation and to crush original investigators.

We think that Dr. Wace and other teachers of theology are perfectly justified in refusing to have their chairs of instruction compared with professorships of science. Theological seminaries are not founded to investigate. Professors of theology are not expected to form a creed for themselves and their pupils, but to expound that of the church which endowed their chairs for the express purpose of having its creed taught. It is not often that provisions of the charter call for this so explicitly as the Andover statutes, but it is called for just as really in the case of all other denominational seminaries. What the churches want is teachers to train young men to recruit their ministry. They appoint and pay professors in their theological schools precisely for the purpose of teaching what the church holds. The churches are not conscious of imposing fetters on the professors, and the professors are almost never conscious of wearing fetters. They generally take up their work as men of mature years, beyond the era of life when the infection of theological novelty is possible, and are perfectly content to go on in the old ways because they believe them to be the best ways. It is only natural, then, that they should be indignant at any hint that, if they could get their salaries just as well, they would hold other views.

Exception ought, perhaps, to be made of some of the more recently founded chairs in the theological seminaries of this country. To keep up with the great development of Oriental studies, several professorships or adjunct professorships have been established in different institutions, and their object involves, of course, continued historical and critical research. It is research, too, in a province comparatively new to the theologian, where he cannot tell beforehand what facts he will come upon. Hence it has more than once happened that when an occupant of such a chair has felt it to be his duty to report the facts as he found them, without attempting to reconcile them with the teaching of his colleagues, the latter have been greatly scandalized. It is a curious thing that it is almost always those professors whose work is nearest like scientific investigation, against whom suspicion of theological unsoundness is directed, and who are looked upon as disturbers of the peace of the churches. We scarce ever hear a rumor that a professor of "Polemical Theology" is "off color" theologically. He lets fly his apostolic blows and knocks to prove himself orthodox, as in old time; it is the teachers of Hebrew and Greek, instructors in Egyptology and Assyriology, who are oftenest charged with the awful crime of German Rationalism. But this, of course, simply proves what we said, that theological seminaries are not intended for investigation, and that it was a mistake of Prof. Huxley to speak of professors in them as if they were mere scientific inquirers, not knowing how the discoveries of to-morrow might change the belief of to-day.

As to the main question, whether our system of theological instruction ought to be as free as the German, it is clear that it never will be so until we have a State Church. It is to the State and not to the Church that the German professors of theology are answerable, and it is for that reason that they have freedom of instruction. The principle was laid down long ago by Frederick William III., in reply to those who were accusing Fichte of being an atheist: "It is not the business of the State to give a decision in reference to his religious principles." And the present Emperor was free to appoint Harnack to the chair of history in Berlin, in the teeth of the remonstrances of the orthodox Lutherans. Such a state of things in the religious affairs of this country cannot be imagined. The nearest we come to it, or probably ever will come to it, is the freedom from denominational obligations enjoyed by professors in our State universities. Prof. Ely has recently borne testimony to the high value placed upon this by the younger teachers of the country, and to their hope that nothing will occur to abridge it. But, of course, no State university can have a school of theology—unless a type of "mediation theology" can be devised more wonderfully non-committal than anything ever invented in Germany.

It is not necessary for us, however, to envy the Germans their freedom of theological teaching, for we have enough of it ourselves. President Patton, we believe, has remarked that the seminary never can undo the work of the college; and, though he spoke in warning lest theological unsoundness should creep into colleges, his saying suggests the great and widening influence for freedom of thought exercised by the leading colleges. And the leading colleges are those which have outgrown denominational limitations. No strictly denominational college has great promise for the future. There is every reason to expect freedom of collegiate teaching to increase from year to year, and this really means, as President Patton says, increased freedom of theological teaching. The teaching, too, which students of theology get from their own reading—far and away the best teaching they have—must always be free until some form of intellectual protection is devised to bar out the product of the foreigner; and, even if that were done, we have not a few domestic rivals of the foreign producer who might more than make good the deficit by their stimulated activity.

ENGLISH "STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES."

We have received several letters inquiring what sums the British Government is paying in the way of "steamship subsidies." In order to furnish a correct answer, we addressed a letter to the Treasury of the United Kingdom requesting information upon this point. We have received an answer under date of June 5, 1889, from which it appears that the total cost of carrying the foreign mails of the United Kingdom, which is called, in official parlance, the Post-office Packet Service, is £498,764, or about $2,500,000. The details are as follows:

EUROPE.	Year 1888-89.
Dover and Calais	£13,200
Dover and Ostend	4,500
Total for conveyance of mails, Europe	£17,700

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICA.	
United Kingdom to United States	£85,000
New York and Bermuda	300
United Kingdom and West Indies	90,250
Belize and New Orleans	1,600
Newfoundland	4,000
Liverpool to Callao	11,500
Liverpool to West Indies and Mexico	1,100
Southampton to Brazil, and River Plate	5,500
Panama to Valparaiso	3,500
	£202,750
Deduct estimated amount of penalties	50
Total for conveyance of mails, America	£202,700
AFRICA.	
United Kingdom and West Coast of Africa	£9,500
United Kingdom and St. Helena and Ascension	4,474
	£13,974
Deduct estimated amount of penalties	50
Total for conveyance of mails, Africa	£13,924
INDIA, CHINA, AND AUSTRALIA.	
Between Brindisi and Bombay (via Suez Canal), calling at Aden	£265,000
Between Brindisi and Shanghai (via Suez Canal), calling at Aden, Colombo, Penang, Singapore, and Hong Kong	
Between Brindisi and Adelaide and between Naples and Adelaide (via Suez Canal)	170,000
	£435,000
Deduct estimated amount of penalties	200
Total for conveyance of mails, India, China, and Australia	£434,800
RECAPITULATION.	
Europe	£17,700
America	202,700
Africa	13,924
Asia and Australia	434,800
	£669,124
Less repaid by Colonies:	
West Indies £22,360	
East Indies 63,000	
Australia 75,000	160,360
Net payment by the Imperial Government for foreign post-office packet service	£498,764

That these payments to steamship lines are simply for services rendered, being exactly like the payments to railway and stage lines for carrying the mails, is made plain by two facts. In the first place, bids for the service are advertised, and they are not restricted to British lines. The lowest bid is accepted invariably without regard to the nationality of the competing lines. Again, the British postal service, foreign and domestic, yields a net revenue of about £3,000,000, the receipts being about £8,000,000 and the expenditures about £5,000,000. The domestic telegraph service is included in these figures, the receipts from which are about equal to the expenses. The post-office is a business department of the Government, of which the foreign-packet service is a branch, and this service is procured on the same terms and conditions as the domestic. It has nothing of the character of a subsidy. It is presumed that the foreign service pays for itself in the postages collected. Certainly the European and American branches more than pay their way. Possibly the East Indian service may show a loss; but if so, it is analogous to our far Western service, where distances are great, expenses heavy, and receipts small.

There is no point of similarity between the English packet service and the proposed subsidies to shipping in this country. In the one a payment is made on the principles of competition and the open market for carrying the mails, the Government being reimbursed by the postage money collected; in the other a bounty is proposed on the basis of mileage sailed. In the former the definite end to be reached is the carrying of letters; in the latter the definite end is the sailing of the ship, or, as the friends of the measure most commonly say, the "carrying of the flag." Their idea is, that if the flag is carried around the world at Government expense, commerce will "follow the flag." Commerce will do nothing of the kind. Commerce will follow the dollar wherever it is to be found, quite regardless of bunting. The flag goes to the North pole sometimes, but commerce never follows it thither. Commerce goes to Liverpool, Havre, Bremen, and Hamburg whether the flag goes there or not.

But it may be said that Great Britain has arrived at her present stage of postal efficiency and postal solvency by subsidies paid in the past, and that she would never have been able to make ends meet in her foreign packet service without a long course of bounties. This may be true, but it does not follow that we, in the year 1889, should begin where England was in 1849. In 1849 it cost a great deal more to run steamships than it now costs, while the receipts were much smaller. There has been a steady lessening of the cost on the one side, and an increase of gain on the other, ever since. We stand to-day on as good a footing as any other country, except for our antiquated navigation laws and our antiquated tariff laws—the one forbidding us to buy ships where they can be got cheapest, and the other crippling commerce by saddling the return cargo with enormous and unnecessary duties.

ENGLISH GUILDS AS IRISH LANDLORDS.

DUBLIN, June 7.

IN the year 1611 James the First granted the greater part of the County of Derry to the Corporation of London, which undertook to colonize it with English and Scotch Protestant settlers. The motives of the plantation were partly political and partly commercial. Great benefit was expected to ensue from the exchange of London manufactured goods for the produce of this fertile country, which, wrote James, "yieldeth store of all necessary for man's sustenance in such measure as may not only maintain itself, but also furnish the city of London yearly with manifold provision." The rapid increase in the population of London was at that time considered dangerous; there were many persons whom "the city could conveniently spare," and so ease itself of "an unsupportable burden, which so surchargeth all the parts of the city that one tradesman can scarce live by another." The city was bound to plant settlers of specified classes within a limited time, to give them "certain estates" "at no uncertain rents," to establish and maintain towns, markets, schools, and churches.

This grant, revoked for breach of its conditions, was renewed by Cromwell and confirmed by Charles II. The ownership of this vast territory thus became vested in a committee of the London corporation known thenceforth as the Irish Society, an ever-changing body, twenty-four in number, half of whom retire each year and cannot be reëlected. The Irish Society divided their estate among the twelve great companies, mercers, grocers, drapers, fishmongers, goldsmiths, skinners, merchant tailors, haberdashers, salters, ironmongers, vintners, clothworkers, reserving to itself the cities of Derry and Coleraine, the woods and fishing.

For more than two hundred years the revenues allotted by the original grants for the municipal purposes of Derry and Coleraine were misapplied, squandered, and embezzled. Up to the present day no by-law of these municipalities is valid until confirmed by the Irish Society at Guildhall. About thirty years ago two Royal Commissions reported that there was neither pretext nor argument for continuing this municipal supremacy, and recommended the dissolution of the Irish Society. Examination of receipts from the property retained by the Irish Society amounting to £219,898, showed the following expenditure: Tavern expenses, £7,412; fees to members, £12,985; law expenses, £36,821; incidental expenses, £18,077. A committee of the citizens of Derry came to the conclusion that the accounts were falsified so as to conceal more unjustifiable outlays.

The Irish Society was the owner of the greater part of the ground on which Derry and Coleraine are built. As landlords, and with authority paramount over the corporations of these towns, their supremacy was complete. The companies who, as grantees of the Irish Society, took their several proportions on the same trusts and subject to the same conditions as those of the original grant, neither observed the conditions nor performed any of the duties of landlords. Until very recent times they sublet their estates as a whole to middlemen, to whom the occupiers were tenants at will, rackrented to the uttermost. Robert Slade, Secretary to the Irish Society, travelled through Derry in 1802, and published a journal, which was afterwards suppressed, of his observations. The object of the Irish Society's charter being the encouragement of a Protestant colony, he was particularly indignant at the treatment the Protestant tenants received. Excessive rents had caused wholesale emigration of the very people whom it was the duty of the city, under their charter, to protect, preserve, and settle with certain estates on the soil. "This rent-raising," he said, "leads me to question the policy, I might say the justice, of the city companies, in letting their land on payment of heavy fines, without stipulating for the performance of the relative duties between landlord and tenant." The increase of rent imposed by the lessee of the clothworkers' estate on his tenants "produced," says Slade, "an almost total emigration among them to America, where they formed a principal part of that undisciplined body which brought about the surrender of the British army at Saratoga."

It is unnecessary to consult hostile opinion as to the management of their estates by the London companies. Deputations of the Irish Society visited the city estates from time to time, and reported that schools, churches, and charitable institutions were non-existent or neglected; the property was "treated as merchandise"; the middlemen "made the most of it during their leases"; "nothing was done to improve the estates, or for the comfort and amelioration of the occupiers"; "gross mismanagement and neglect" existed; the tenants "were made to pay very high rents, and the cotters lived in perfect hovels." These reports were discontinued after 1841, from which date many of the companies obtained control of their estates by lapse of the middlemen's leases. Rapacity and neglect, however, still continued. The companies set their faces against tenant right, increased rents upon the tenants' outlay, refused to grant building leases, and, after the Land Act of 1870, claimed a customary right to increase the rent at the end of every twenty-one years. In 1854 rents in the town on the salters' estate were trebled, and in 1867 a number of rents were again doubled. The inhabitants complained that they were "driven to distraction."

Between 1870 and 1880 the mercers, drapers, skinners, and fishmongers raised their rents,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and defeated the tenants' attempts to avail themselves of the supposed advantages of the first Land Act. Some of the companies had sold their estates before this time; but in 1880 the annual value of the London estates in Derry amounted to over $400,000. A Royal Commission in 1880 reported that the property of these guilds was of a public character, and not applicable to private purposes such as banquets and fees to members. Their available income from English and Irish estates is about $2,200,000, and the actual expenditure is roughly classified thus:

Public and benevolent objects	$750,000
Banquets	500,000
Management and fees to members	500,000
Rates, taxes, and repairs	375,000

The report of the Royal Commission in 1880 gave occasion for the remark that the Guild dinners would be followed by their desserts, but no legislative action has yet been taken. Meantime the companies still retaining estates in Ireland are taking advantage of the Purchase Acts to sell to their tenants, and are thus transferring the proceeds of property, expressly granted for Irish public purposes, to England.

These wealthy and powerful corporations have always posed as model landlords, and yet, with the exception of scanty doles to clergy, schools, and some local institutions, they have spent absolutely nothing on promoting the comfort of their tenants, or improving their farms, while they consistently claimed every right the letter of the law gave them to raise rents and confiscate the improvements of their tenantry. They paid their agents liberally, and gave plenty of work to their solicitors, but otherwise the revenues raised in Ireland have been spent in England, to a large extent, in gluttonous eating and drinking, and in fees improperly distributed among their members. Their profuse hospitality to politicians and public men of every shade of opinion has covered many of their iniquities and averted many threatened inquisitions into their affairs.

In the process of disposal of their estates, it has just come to light that one of the wealthiest of these companies, the drapers, has employed means to effect a sale to their tenants which, in the case of a private owner, would expose him to universal condemnation, if not to criminal proceedings for intimidation. From correspondence recently published, and questions asked but not yet fully answered in Parliament, it appears that this company entered into negotiations for the sale of their estate, which extends to 27,000 acres. In 1880 the then agent reported that there were smaller arrears of rent on this than on the estate of any other company, but, in consequence of the adverse seasons and low prices since prevalent, many of the tenants owed several years' rent in 1888. To give point to their negotiations, as the tenants' offer was less than the company's demand, the latter served ejectments wholesale; the tenants' stock and goods were seized, and the sheriff, with a large force of police, bailiffs, and siege apparatus, attended to take possession of the farms. These proceedings were stayed on the tenants' executing agreements to buy at the prices in excess of those they originally refused by the addition of the rent and costs due. These agreements, signed at the bayonet's point, concealed the fact that judicial rents had been fixed by the county court judge; the old and higher rents were stated as the legal rents on the face of these agreements, for the purpose, apparently, of making the price seem to be a smaller number of "years' purchase" on the rent than if the legal rents had been expressed, as they should have been.

Intimidation, undue influence, and duress were thus employed to extort the execution of contracts which are supposed to be matters of voluntary arrangement, and the contracts drawn up by the company's solicitors—the tenants having no professional advice—if not actually fraudulent in the concealment of material facts, were certainly misleading. Even Mr. Balfour has gone so far as to admit in the House of Commons that the company's action was "discreditable." Mr. T. Healy has asked that the company shall be prosecuted; but as a thoroughly conservative solidarity exists among these powerful and wealthy corporations, it is unlikely that the Government will countenance any legal proceedings against them, and none could be undertaken except at the instance of the Government.

This incident may, however, lead to an early consideration of the trusts under which these companies hold their Irish estates. Although the force of public opinion has, during the last five years, led the city guilds to spend less on dinners and fees to their members, and more upon objects of acknowledged public utility, nothing has been done to restrain them from spending their Irish incomes in England, and from throwing the proceeds of their Irish sales into hotchpot with their English property. A just appropriation of this guild property, whenever Parliament takes up the matter effectively, would require that the value of the Irish property in its original extent should be allocated to Irish public purposes. The Irish party have up to this shown great supineness on this question, but, in the hands of Mr. Timothy Healy, a new departure may be expected.

AN IRISHMAN.

POLITICS AND THE EXPOSITION.

PARIS, June 13, 1889.

THE Exposition continues to be the all-absorbing topic of interest; the number of visitors increases constantly; on the 10th of June (Whitsuntide Monday) there were as many as 353,000. Curiously enough, the doors of the Exhibition are surrounded with boys and women who offer to you tickets at half-price. The regular price is one franc in the daytime, but these tickets have been thrown on the market in such abundance that they have gradually fallen to fifty centimes. There was a sort of lottery made to cover the expenses of the Exhibition: 1,200,000 lottery tickets were issued and subscribed for at the price of 25 francs, each bearing twenty-five common tickets of entrance to the Exhibition. Most of the subscribers have merely kept the body of the bond, which gives them the chance to get a large prize when the drawings of the lottery take place, and have disposed at almost any price of the twenty-five tickets which were joined to the bond. Thus it is that the speculators have thrown on Paris 30,000,000 tickets of entrance to the Exhibition, or at least a large proportion of that number, and it will be a long time before they are absorbed and the entrance to the Exhibition comes back to its normal price. The spirit of speculation has entered everywhere. You can hardly find a person who has not bought one of the bonds I mention, and sometimes at a premium, with the hope of getting one of the prizes of 200,000 francs which have been promised to the public. The lottery used to be a public institution in France, as it is still in Italy; it was abolished in 1830, and is now forbidden in principle, but *de facto* the Government can authorize a lottery when it has a charitable object, and the number of authorized lotteries is increasing every day. You can hardly enter a tobacco-shop without seeing lottery-tickets for sale. The Exhibition lottery was authorized by the State, and it has at least had the advantage of furnishing the funds necessary to the Exhibition.

Day after day some new attraction is added to the great show in the Champ de Mars and the Place des Invalides; every train brings more strangers, the hotels are crowded, the boulevards are teeming with people, and, at night, under the electric lamps, thousands of visitors are seen sitting in front of the cafés in the open air. Wherever you go, you find a crowd. The restaurants and the theatres complained at first that the Exhibition drew away all their customers, and even had the impertinence to ask that the Exhibition should be shut at night at least three times a week. They do not complain any more. I went to the Français a few days ago to see Mounet-Sully in *Hamlet* (a more admirable and poetical *Hamlet* it is difficult to imagine), and every seat was taken; the audience, which was almost exclusively composed of foreigners, showed a degree of enthusiasm not often exhibited by Parisians. Go where you like, to the races, to Buffalo Bill's, to the reviews of our gymnastic societies, to the Exhibition, you find crowds everywhere; the population seems to multiply itself and to have a sort of ubiquity.

In the midst of all this confusion and excitement, politics seems quite lost sight of. The Chamber was almost forgotten, as well as the High Senatorial Court of Justice, which is looking into the Boulangist conspiracy, till, a few days ago, some new arrests were made, houses searched, and trunks seized, containing, it is said, 30,000 letters and cards received by General Boulanger. It seems very much as if the Government wished to drag the inquest along so as to gain time and to avoid a trial during what may be called the golden days of the Exhibition. Boulanger himself is in London, and seems to be as quiet there as he was active and restless in France. I was in England a few days ago, and my English friends all agreed that his attitude was that of great reserve: he did not force himself on public attention; he was received by a few people, but he did not allow journalists to interview him, he did not make long speeches, and, whenever he dined out, he surprised the company more by his silence than by his sayings. His lieutenants here are not so quiet. They are probably discouraged, but they continue to assume an air of great confidence, and keep up the *feu sacré* as well as they can. Some days ago they were to hold a public meeting and have a banquet at Angoulême; but when they arrived in that town, they found a large military force in front of the railway station, and, after some remarks made by one of them to a commissary of police, they were all taken to the prison of Angoulême, where they were kept a few days. One of them was a deputy, M. Laguerre, who thought he should be covered by his parliamentary immunities, but who found that M. Constans, the present Home Minister, did not respect these immunities so long as he had a majority at his back. When M. Laguerre, in prison, made his protest, he was told that he would be set free if he would promise not to appear and speak at the banquet which had been announced.

It is rather curious to recall in this circumstance the famous banquet which was the cause of the Revolution of 1848, and to find the men who made a revolution in order to assure the right of public meeting, now opposing military force and all the power of the State to a few men who wish to hold a banquet in the distant and quiet city of Angoulême. An interpellation was made yesterday in the Cham-

LICENSED TO ONELOOK
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber on this subject, but the Minister, M. Constans, came forward, and proudly said: "Ipse adsum qui feci." He took a bold attitude: he was not going, he said, to *tolerate* any agitation in the country; he would not have a few men going about creating an unnecessary excitement in departments to which they did not belong. This promises well for the liberty of the next elections. Constans has been Governor of Cochinchina, and has learned in Asia the rules of a free government. Under public pressure, M. Laguerre and his associates have been allowed to leave their prison till the day of their trial; but it is clear that M. Constans and the prefects who received his orders have adopted a policy of intimidation. All parties in France invoke liberty as long as they are in opposition, and show their contempt for it when they are in power.

If France seems to have become indifferent to the incidents of domestic politics, she is even more so with regard to foreign affairs. It may be said that the great mass of the electoral body ignores what is going on beyond the frontier; it does not care for the journey of the King of Italy and of Crispi to Berlin—for the details of the military convention signed between Prussia and Italy, which is said to have reinforced the alliance between the two countries—for the attitude of the English Cabinet in face of the triple alliance of Prussia, Austria, and Italy. The incidents of the political life of the new principalities and kingdoms leave our public absolutely indifferent, or are only regarded on what may be called their dramatic side. There is but one sentiment which, rightly or wrongly, has pervaded the public mind, a sentiment which is spontaneous and ineradicable: it is a belief in a necessary, a fatal combination of the forces of Republican France and of autocratic Russia against the forces of Germany. Every utterance of the Emperor of Russia, in this respect, has its importance; and when, the other day, he said that his only faithful ally was the Prince of Montenegro, there was a thrill of satisfaction all through the country. This indirect denunciation of the great continental Powers, this bold assumption of Russia's independence, her content with the alliance of a poor little mountainous principality, which can only bring a few thousand men in the field—was not this an indirect promise made to France, an indirect hope extended to her, an indirect protest against the influences which are paramount in the constellation of Prussia, Austria, and Italy? It would be difficult to convince an average Frenchman that this indirect promise may be illusive, that France cannot count, in the last analysis, in case of a new war with Germany, on the support of Russia. In vain will you tell him that there is no treaty of alliance between the French Republic and St. Petersburg, that the nature of the Republican Constitution makes a secret alliance an impossibility. He will tell you that no signed document is necessary, that the interests of France and Russia are common, and that the two countries must be found together in the next European struggle.

History has many lessons which are not always understood. Prussia and Russia may be, or may appear at times, very inimical; their mutual relations may not be wrongly expressed by the verses which Catullus wrote for his mistress:

> "Odi et amo; quare id faciam, fortasse requiris.
> Nescio! sed fieri sentio et excrucior."

The two great empires of the north have combined more than they have separated their action. If the worst came to the worst, if Germany felt the pressure of a great danger, she could give Russia satisfaction which it would be difficult for France to give: she could, in the last analysis, show her the way to Constantinople, and oblige Austria to come to a settlement with Russia in the peninsula of the Balkans. A partition of Turkey, similar to the old partition of Poland, is always possible. The interests of Russia can be satisfied in a thousand ways in the East, she can obtain free access to the Mediterranean; her ambition can find many channels, and her present sullen attitude is not owing to any platonic love for France, but merely to the discontent created by the Treaty of Berlin.

Such reasonings, however, have no force here; and, what with the success of the Exposition, the lull in domestic politics, and our absolute belief in the sympathies of Russia, we are resolved to be optimists—as long, at least, as possible.

Correspondence.

WASHINGTON'S PEDIGREE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The public interest in everything concerning Washington is my excuse for troubling you with a few words about his pedigree. All genealogists are aware of two facts—first, that Sir Isaac Heard, Garter King of Arms, in 1791 supposed that he had traced George Washington's ancestry; second, that the late Col. Joseph L. Chester in 1866 entirely disproved this affiliation on the essential point of the identification of the emigrants with any of the persons recorded in the English pedigree. Since then the problem has remained unsolved, although Col. Chester was most persistent in collecting all the data recoverable in regard to all of the name.

I am now most happy to say that Mr. Henry F. Waters, who has succeeded Col. Chester in the honorable position of the best investigator of American pedigrees in England, has discovered a very promising clue as to the parentage of Laurence and John Washington, the emigrants to Virginia. As Mr. Waters's results are to be published in the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, I can only state now that he has found a Laurence Washington who had sons Laurence, baptized 1635, John (baptism not recorded), and William, baptized 1641. There is positive evidence to identify the son Laurence with the Virginian colonist who died in 1676. Mr. Waters's brilliant success in tracing out the family of the Rev. John Harvard, to say nothing of the less distinguished pedigrees which he has traced, is the best proof that he will follow up and amplify this initial discovery.

But now is the time, in furtherance of his work in England, to show clearly what is known of the Washingtons in America, especially in the first generation, and therein I ask for your assistance.

Sir Isaac Heard identified the emigrants with John and Laurence, sons of Laurence W. of Sulgrave and Brington. Col. Chester proved that this John was knighted in 1623, twice married, and that his widow, Dorothy, died in 1678—all facts entirely incompatible with his being the emigrant to Virginia. His brother Laurence, born in 1602, was made Rector of Purleigh in Essex in 1633, ejected as a Royalist, and afterwards allowed to hold a poor living. His later history had not been traced by Col. Chester. Although the old error has at times shown vitality since, it may be accepted as a fixed fact that the emigrants were *not* these sons of Laurence of Sulgrave.

In 1872 the late Albert Welles published a pretentious 'Washington Genealogy,' tracing the emigrants to Leonard Washington of Warton. This affiliation was presumably a rank forgery, as no authorities were given, and the records at Warton do not mention any such children.

Col. Chester wrote me in 1879 that he had an old deed which he presumed was signed by John Washington, the emigrant, but he needed an American example of his signature for comparison.

Bishop Meade, in his admirable book on the 'Old Churches and Families of Virginia,' in 1857, vol. i, 167, states that the will of Laurence Washington was then at Tappahannock, the county-seat of Essex County. This will is printed in full in Welles's book. Meade also states that the original will of John Washington, of which he gives an abstract, was then on record at Westmoreland Court-house, "in an old book of wills, though in a somewhat mutilated form."

By the kindness of R. A. Brock, Esq., of Richmond, the highest living authority on Virginian genealogies, I learn that this will is no longer on file. This confirms the unpleasant rumor that this document disappeared during the late civil war. I therefore appeal to your readers to assist us by calling attention to the great importance of the recovery of this document, believing that it cannot have been destroyed, and may have fallen into the hands of those who are simply ignorant of the value of the paper beyond a mere curiosity. I also hope that some of your readers will take the trouble to inform us in detail of what took place in Westmoreland County during the war, what troops occupied the Court-house, and what other damage, if any, was inflicted there.

In the same connection I would state that in the *Historical Magazine for 1867*, pages 29 and 30, Mr. Dawson printed a document furnished by M. M. Jones, Esq., of Utica, N. Y. It was a copy made by him in 1862 at Annapolis, from the Colonial Records there. I hope some one will examine and report if the papers still exist there, and that search will be made for the letter of John Washington, dated September 30, 1659. This letter has been cited as a proof that John came over in Edward Prescott's ship in 1658. A careful reading makes it doubtful that Washington was anything more than an active complainant in the matter.

I remain yours very respectfully,

William H. Whitmore.

Boston, Mass., P. O. Box 3478.

GROUPING BY PARTIES VS. GROUPING BY OFFICES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In your issue of the 13th inst., you refer with approval to a suggested amendment to the Connecticut Ballot Bill, allowing the grouping of candidates under party names upon the official ballots. The practical difference between the system of printing the whole ticket of each party in a group by itself, and that of grouping the names of all candidates for each office under the title of that office, is that the former makes it easier to vote a "straight" ticket than a "split" one. In regard to this you say:

"There is no objection to the grouping by parties. Such arrangement may aid the ignorant voters in marking their ballots, and will certainly diminish the chances of confusion and delay in putting the new system into practice."

In your issue of April 25, "J. H. W.," in his letter about the Rhines vote-recording ma-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chine, objected to the system of grouping by parties, as fostering blind adherence to party candidates by practically inviting the voter to vote a straight ticket. While fully agreeing with him, I think that even a more fundamental objection may be made. The Constitutions of Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee require that elections shall be equal, and this equality is obviously so essential that it may probably be considered a part of the common law of all the States. This cannot be merely an equality as regards the voters; the candidates also must stand on equal terms, for the rights of voters and candidates are clearly correlative. My objection to the system of grouping by parties is simply that it violates this equality. The Constitutions of these ten States know nothing of straight tickets and give them no privileges. If I choose to vote for candidates of different parties, or representing different bodies of citizens, I have in Pennsylvania a constitutional right to do so with exactly the same ease and facility with which my neighbor votes his straight ticket, and I believe I should have a natural right to do so anywhere. The Legislature has no right to make me pick out my candidates from all parts of the ticket and mark each name separately, when my neighbor can exercise his full right of suffrage by a simple mark against the party title or even by marking every name in one single group. There are very few things in which the law does or can require equality, but an election is such a thing; and so long as practical equality can be secured, there is no reason why it should be surrendered in the smallest degree.

This inequality of party men and independents may seem trifling, but it is just such trifles that turn the scale in an election. It may be infinitesimal as regards each individual vote, but collectively it puts at a great disadvantage all candidates whose strength lies in the facility of independent voting. Human nature being what it is, thousands of voters are certain to vote the easiest way; and just so long as the party way is the easiest, we may expect to see elections carried on strict party lines, and to have candidates of the leading parties gain additional strength on that account. A system which encourages men, as "J. H. W." points out, to vote blindly, works against those candidates whose success depends upon the voters exercising some care, and not voting blindly; and if, under any method of elections, candidates or sets of candidates can receive the votes of their supporters with less trouble to them, even to a trifling extent, than other candidates can, the right of equal elections, which is secured by the constitution in some States, and should be respected in all, is violated both as to candidates and as to voters.

CHARLES C. BINNEY.

PHILADELPHIA, June 17, 1889.

A REMEDY FOR LEGISLATIVE DEGENERACY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A perusal of your columns for the last ten years will show an ever-repeated complaint at the gradual degeneration of our legislative bodies. It is asserted that men of real ability will no longer be candidates for State legislatures, or that, if they consent to enter these assemblies, they do so only with a view to the quickest possible promotion into the higher sphere of national politics. As a consequence, these legislatures are said to sink gradually to the low moral and mental level which city councils and county boards throughout the country have long ago reached.

Will you allow me to suggest a possible remedy for this dangerous state of things?

The business of legislative bodies, as at present constituted, is twofold. In the first place, it is legislation proper—that is, the making of statutes of a public and permanent character. This evidently requires men of the highest character, of the widest information, greatest sagacity and experience. It is here precisely that our legislatures fail most signally. The statute-book of every State is encumbered with foolish, mischievous, or inefficient laws. But this is only the smallest portion of the business of a legislative session. The greater part of the work is really of an administrative, not legislative character. It is work of precisely the same nature as that performed by county boards and city councils. It consists of the appropriation of money for the support of public institutions, the adjustment of salaries of State employees, the granting of special privileges, like the building of dams across rivers, and a multitude of other business of a similar description. It will certainly not be claimed that work of this kind requires the same order of talents as the passing of statutes which, in their effect, may change the whole course of development of a State.

Why, then, I should ask, must these two entirely distinct kinds of business be transacted by the same set of men? Why can we not elect an administrative assembly, or whatever you may choose to call it, to meet annually and transact business of an administrative nature, while leaving the legislative function proper to a body of men sitting at longer intervals, say once in five years, and elected for this special purpose? I cannot doubt but that this arrangement would greatly elevate the character of the legislatures, for men of standing and talent would be attracted by the greater dignity attaching to a body rarely meeting, while, on the other hand, the small-bore politicians now swarming in legislative halls would find no room for the exercise of their peculiar talents in the legislature proper. They would strive to secure a seat in the administrative council, where alone they would be enabled to further the special interests each of his constituency—for it is well known that that is the only object the average well-meaning and honest member of a legislature has in view. The corrupt man, also, and his accompanying evil-doer, the lobbyist, would find little or no room for their pernicious activity in the legislature where no "jobs" are to be done and no "deals" to be effected.

There is nothing radical or revolutionary in this scheme. It is merely a further development in the direction which in former times led to the diversification of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government.—Respectfully yours,

ERNEST BRUNCKEN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

THE PLACING OF GREEK TEMPLES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The *Nation* of March 14 contains a letter from Mr. W. J. Stillman in which he asserts that the Greek temples were located rather with reference to defence than to architectural effect. While I have never been in Greece, I am fairly familiar with such of the Sicilian temples as were visible thirteen years ago, and especially with those at Segesta, Selinus, and Agrigentum which he mentions. From my memory of all of them I feel inclined to call his statement in question.

The temples at Selinus might perhaps be cited on both sides of the question, as they stand together on a slight elevation at the head of what was once the harbor, but what is now an alluvial swamp. They are in a commanding situation, which seems to have been reserved for public buildings, and might perhaps have been a citadel; but the beauty of the situation would have justified their position on that ground.

But it is more especially on the temples in the other two cities that I base my argument. Agrigentum, like Lausanne in Switzerland, but unlike any other city with which I am acquainted, is built on one long hillside sloping up about eight feet in one hundred from the Mediterranean, the nearest point of the old city having been about a mile and a half from the sea. The city in its prime was very large, and stretched upward even to the summit of the range of hills, where, indeed, are the ruins of a small temple, but nothing like an acropolis. On the contrary, the great temples, of which there are at least six, were scattered along the low southern edge of the city, the part nearest the sea. The temples of Concord* and of Lacinian Juno were situated close by the wall, on a slight elevation, the scarped face of which forms the wall in that place. This is formed of a crumbling sandstone full of recent shells, and so soft that it can almost be worked with a sharp stick; and besides this, it is honey-combed with tombs. These may of course be of later date than the temples, but the place was never one of very great strength. The temples of Olympian Jupiter and of Castor and Pollux, a little further west, as I recollect them, do not seem any more to have been situated with reference to defence, while the temple of Æsculapius was outside the walls and at a considerable distance from them.

This lowest part of the city can hardly have been chosen for the temples on account of its defensive strength; but, on the other hand, the view of the long series of public buildings standing out in bold relief must have been wonderfully impressive to the stranger approaching the city from its port—especially that of the two temples first named, which, from their position on the low scarped cliff, with no intervening wall, would have been visible down to the stylobate, and would have seemed to have all the added height of the rock. The little eminence on which they stand makes them now equally imposing from above as from below; but it is possible that the upper view may have been partially cut off by buildings.

My own idea concerning these temples is, that they were built in the long interval of prosperity between the death of Theron and the attack of the Carthaginians, when to the luxurious city the idea of danger must have seemed almost as remote as it does to us to-day. When all the available space in what was doubtless the earliest settlement at the top of the hill had been gradually occupied in the days of the city's early struggles, and the city, grown to greatness, had already stretched far down the hill, these new magnificent public buildings were placed along the southern wall so as best to show forth the splendor of the place.

The temple at Segesta is placed on the summit of a conical hill, which shows no signs of having had other structures on its slopes, and apparently never was inside of the city limits. Although it could have been readily fortified, it must always have been an outpost and not a

* It should be borne in mind that, with the exception of the temple of Olympian Jupiter, the names ascribed to these ruins are fictitious, being given *faute de mieux*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

citadel. The hill adjoining, on which the city is built, does not seem ever to have been so covered with buildings that a temple site could not readily have been found corresponding to the sites at Agrigentum and nearer at hand; but as I remember the majestic way in which this little green hill, rising in an amphitheatre of bare, rugged mountains, is crowned by the solemn harmony of the perfect outlines of this temple of the people's gods, it is as impossible for me to believe that this situation was not chosen for its beauty as that the temple itself was built by chance without a plan. N. J. B.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., June 17, 1889.

THE CENTURY DICTIONARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am surprised to learn, from Mr. Peirce's very frank letter in your issue of the 20th inst., that some of the definitions of the 'Century Dictionary' which I criticised were his. The contrast which I mentioned between the definitions in mathematics and mathematical physics and those in astronomy and experimental physics I supposed to mark the line between his work and that of some less skilful hand. Still more surprising is it to see him call my strictures on the description of the 'Almagest' of Ptolemy as a "book or collection of problems" "hypercritical." Would he defend a lexicographer who should define the 'Mécanique Céleste' as a collection of mathematical and astronomical problems by Laplace? Yet the description would be fully as correct as that in question.

In the case of the word *alidade*, my objection was directed to the statement that it is an attachment of every instrument for measuring angles. Are the stone piers on which the meridian circles of our great observatories are supported ever called alidades?

The sentence under *Law of action and reaction* which I supposed to be an interpolation is, as Mr. Peirce correctly infers, this: "By *action* is here meant, according to Newton, a quantity measured by the force multiplied into the velocity of the point of application." I think he is entirely mistaken in supposing that Newton gives this definition of the word as used in his statement of the law. I can find no such definition in the 'Principia.'

Since my strictures upon some of the definitions on the 'Century Dictionary' appeared in your issue of the 13th inst., I have hastily glanced through the remainder of the letter A, and noticed the following faulty definitions. The word *approximation* is defined as if it were identical with what is known as the method of successive approximations. The definition of *diurnal arc* is meaningless: "the arc described by the heavenly bodies in consequence of the diurnal rotation of the earth." Of course there is no definite arc thus described, but only an endless repetition of one and the same circle. The term is actually applied to that portion of the sun's apparent daily path which is above the horizon. The same term is, I believe, applied to the apparent paths of the stars above the horizon. *Nocturnal arc* is new to me, but I think its definition also incorrect. *Argus*, the constellation, is omitted, though *Aries* and *Aquarius* are included. S. NEWCOMB.

CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I desire to correct a statement made in your editorial for May 30, 1889, entitled "A Revised Westminster." In the paragraph beginning, "One should bear in mind," etc., you say:

"The analogy is fair enough, though it overlooks the fact that the same judges may be found in all three bodies, reviewing, for example, in Synod or Assembly, decisions which they themselves have helped to make in Presbytery. It is quite out of the question, then, to have a fresh and impartial review by higher judicatories of a case arising in a lower."

A little reflection would have shown you *à priori* that such a state of things would not be tolerated in a body standing so high in honesty and ability as the Presbyterian clergymen. Before making such a statement, you should have examined the Constitution of the church about which you were writing, to see if these things were really so. In the Constitution, book ii., chap. vii., section iii., par. xii., you may read: "Members of judicatories appealed from cannot be allowed to vote in the superior judicatory on any question connected with the appeal."

Please publish this correction as the only way you can make amends.

Yours respectfully,

ABEL H. HUIZINGA.

NEW PALTZ, N. Y., June 16, 1889.

[We were not writing of judicial cases, but of the method of effecting constitutional changes in the Presbyterian Church. If the Presbytery of New York votes in favor of creed revision, there will be and can be no "appeal" from that decision; and the members of the Presbytery who help to make it might be in Synod to vote the same way on the same question there, and some of them would surely be in the next Assembly to sustain their views in that body. Our correspondent must know this, and will see, on reflection, that he entirely missed the point of the remark he takes exception to.—ED. NATION.]

THE *MANHATTAN'S* CONTRIBUTORS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I contributed to the *Manhattan* an article that was ready to have appeared (with illustrations) in the number after the last. In my case the editor "acted" like a gentleman until the concern suspended. He promised faithfully "as a gentleman" that he would see that my manuscript was cherished and preserved, whatever might happen to the magazine; for I had suspicions that disaster was coming. After the disaster no communications were noticed, though I have the best reasons for believing that they reached the eyes of the gentlemanly editor. The present whereabouts of my MS. and of the illustrations is unknown to "another wretched contributor" who has survived the loss. R. N.

THE IDEAL HOLIDAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Walking last night through a suburb of Boston, I passed the gate of a brewery, where a number of workmen were smoking their pipes and listening to a fat orator standing in his shirt-sleeves before them. The scraps of wisdom that I caught in hurrying by would require more space than they deserve were I to indicate all the interspersed profanity by dashes.

"I tell you," declared the orator, with a German tang to his tongue, "there's not a legal holiday in the United States!"

He paused a moment for a reply, which soon came from an Irishman: "How about the Foorth of July?"

"Ach!" said the German; "what could stop a man from working then if he wanted to?"

That was all I heard. It opened up such a vista of legal holidays in Labor's millennium, when officers of the law, armed with pistols and clubs, are to shoot or knock down the first man lifting his hand to do a stroke of work, that I think the workingman—whatever his employment—should contemplate the happy vision. M. H., JR.

BOSTON, June 17, 1889.

Notes.

FORDS, HOWARD & HULBERT have in press 'Signs of Promise,' sermons preached in Plymouth pulpit during the past two years by the Rev. Lyman Abbott.

J. B. Lippincott Co. publish shortly a midsummer novel, 'Three Days,' by Samuel Williams Cooper, with illustrations.

Ginn & Co. will publish in July 'Pages choisies des Mémoires du Duc de Saint-Simon,' edited for school use by Alphonse N. Van Daell; and, in August, Dumas's 'Trois Mousquetaires,' edited by Prof. F. C. Sumichrast.

Willard Fracker & Co. will soon publish in book form the Chicago *Tribune* prize novel entitled 'By a Hair's Breadth,' by Edith Sessions Tupper, who is now at work upon a new novel to be entitled 'By Whose Hand.'

Col. T. W. Higginson has been appointed by Gov. Ames of Massachusetts to undertake the writing of a history of the State's soldiers and sailors in the civil war, as provided by the last Legislature. Five years are allowed for the task, which has certainly fallen into good hands, and the execution of which will profit by the interval of a generation since the events in question.

The Messrs. Rivington, London, send us the new issue of the 'Annual Register' for 1888. The year was eminently one of transition in the politics of the four leading countries of the globe. The Tory policy maintained itself in Great Britain, but without inspiring any of its supporters with a belief in its finality, and with manifold signs of the growth of opposition among the electors at large. Across the Channel, Boulanger was rolling up his majorities, and disputing with President Carnot the leadership of the nation. Germany had her three emperors in quick succession. In the United States the Democratic Administration was unseated. All this the 'Register' tells with its customary incorporation of documents. It gives a part of the Republican platform on which Mr. Harrison was elected, omitting the virtuous professions in regard to civil-service reform. One might find fault with this; but the editor disarms criticism by only aiming to present "some of the most important 'planks,'" and we all know now that that on the civil service was one of the least important. The usual survey of literature, art, and science, and the obituary of eminent persons conclude the volume.

Mr. Lewis Sergeant renews his 'Government Year-Book' with a second volume for 1889 (London: T. Fisher Unwin). The peculiarity of this annual is its aim to exhibit the working of the governments included in its scope, with constant reference to the organic law of the several nations; or, in the words of the original preface, "to review each year the most striking of contemporary events, and to note how they hinge upon or tend to modify political organizations." As this is in the spirit of Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bryce's great study, 'The American Commonwealth,' one might have expected a reference to this work in the present volume, in the chapter devoted to the United States; but there is no sign that the present editor ever heard of it. He has reproduced last year's sketch of our Government with no other significant alteration than the giving in full the text of some of the amendments to the Constitution which were summarized last year. Now, as then, while telling of State railway commissions, he has no mention of the Inter-State Commerce Commission. He also allows himself to repeat his whimsical remark that the civil war was a "not very satisfactory manner" of settling the questions of slavery and national unity. The typography of the 'Government Year-Book' has been much improved, and the permanent skeleton of the work, the account of institutions, has been wisely separated from the yearly record of the events which develop and react upon the fundamental law.

Ginn & Co. put on the American market a 'Latin-English Dictionary,' for "Junior Boys in Schools," by C. G. Gepp and A. E. Haigh, whose scheme has much to recommend it. Stress has been laid on poetic usages and constructions; "words peculiar to Plautus or Lucretius, or to prose writers subsequent to the reign of Trajan, have been purposely excluded"; proper names and their derivatives are inserted in alphabetical order, as are syncopated and contracted forms, etc., etc. The references are to standard English grammars. The only fault we have to find with this admirably printed little volume is that the type is perilously fine. For infrequent reference this would be a slight objection, but for daily use it is a very serious one.

A third sheet of the whole State completes the Atlas of New Jersey, published by the State Geological Survey. The first was political, the second a relief-map; the present (numbered 20) is colored for the geological formations. The newer and the older portions of the territory are clearly marked off, and their line of division very nearly coincides with that of the Pennsylvania Railroad. The course of the terminal moraine of the great northern ice-sheet, whose southernmost limit is Perth Amboy, is also exhibited, and is approximately identical with that of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad, after the moraine begins its westerly trend at Summit. The execution of this sheet, like that of the rest of the Atlas, is of a high order, as is customary with what proceeds from Mr. Julius Bien's establishment. We should add that the sheets of the Atlas are procurable separately, at twenty-five cents apiece, by addressing Mr. Irving S. Upson, New Brunswick, N. J. The demand for them, we understand, has been large.

The annual report of the State Geologist of New Jersey, Prof. Geo. H. Cook, derives its technical interest from an extended discussion of the red sandstone area, by his assistant, Mr. Frank L. Nason. The endeavor is made to trace the synchronous horizons in this rock, to determine thereby the lines of faults, and thus to throw light upon the marked inclination of a sedimentary deposit nearly three miles in thickness, whose movement in one mass is hard to conceive of.

The seventh annual report (for 1887-88) of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens has to tell of the completion and occupancy of the new building, of the failure as yet to secure an endowment which will maintain a permanent director, of the temporary arrangement with Dr. Waldstein, etc. The work of the year is described by Prof. D'Ooge and Prof. Merriam, the excavations at Sicyon and Icaria possessing the chief interest. But of these our Greek correspondents have sufficiently spoken. The report is very freely and beautifully illustrated with heliotype views of the School and of the scene of excavations at Icaria. There is besides a map of northeastern Attica and a drawing after a graceful statue found at Sicyon.

The May *Library Bulletin* of Cornell University gives the present size of the collection as in excess of 102,000 volumes and 29,000 pamphlets.

Judge Mellen Chamberlain of the Boston Public Library read before the Massachusetts Society for Promoting Good Citizenship last February a biographical sketch of "Josiah Quincy, the Great Mayor." This has now been reprinted by the Society, with a steel portrait of the man who was both a great mayor, a great administrator, a great orator, and a very eminent statesman, and whom it would be hard to parallel now in any one of his public aspects, let alone all combined. The tract is very properly issued by a society having at heart the making of good citizens.

There was an error in our recent note on the late meeting of the American Library Association. We spoke of "modes of entry favoring popular ignorance in opposition to the more theoretically consistent practice of the British Museum—in favor, that is, of entry under much used pseudonyms in place of the real name, under the titles of British noblemen, and under the best known instead of under the last name of a married or divorced or remarried woman." The practice of the British Museum is correctly stated only in the last two cases: it enters noblemen under family names and married women under the last name; but in the first case it enters not merely well-known but all pseudonyms under the false name with a reference from the real name.

It is announced that only seven more instalments of the Life of Lincoln will appear in the *Century*.

Capt. Vangele's account of his explorations which settled the dispute among geographers as to the identity of the Mobangi and the Welle Rivers, is contained in the June Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society. He describes the natives dwelling along the river for some four hundred miles above its confluence with the Congo as fine specimens of their race, having some mechanical skill, being "very fair workers in iron" for instance, but as inveterate cannibals. Though the various tribes are constantly engaged in raiding each other, he did not see a single slave. "All that is killed is eaten on the spot; what is captured alive is carried off, and eaten as the occasion arises." Several times he attempted to rescue these unfortunate captives. "'*It is meat*,' they always replied, 'and we don't sell it.' In fact, it is very characteristic that the names used to designate the man reserved for meat and the goat, whose destiny is the same, are almost similar, the first being *moboli* and the second *mboli*." Beyond the furthest limit reached by Mr. Grenfell in the *Peace*, he came among natives whose women had hair "hanging down in long and slender curling tresses finally united in one. I measured some of these tresses more than six feet long. Some of the women rolled these tresses round their heads like turbans," keeping them in place by "well carved and well designed" ivory pins. They also wore ivory bracelets which "seem to have been made on the lathe." The further eastward he went, the more densely populated and fertile he found the country. At the same time the friendliness of the natives changed to hostility, which culminated in a determined attack upon the expedition when within some sixty miles of a point on the Welle reached by Dr. Junker, and Capt. Vangele was reluctantly compelled to turn back.

The last three numbers of the *Portfolio* (Macmillan) continue Mr. Loftie's articles on Westminster Abbey, with numerous illustrations; the April number concludes Mr. Selwyn Brinton's two on the Certosa of Pavia, and Mr. Page's four on Dartmoor. Mr. A. H. Palmer begins in May a series on the famous animal painter, Joseph Wolf. In May and June Mr. Reginald T. Bloomfield makes use of MSS. and drawings at Chatsworth to throw a little more light on the career of Inigo Jones, not neglecting his architecture, but laying more stress on his designs for the stage—in the performance of masques at court, etc.—and his part in introducing movable scenery, which the public theatres still discarded. These details are very interesting and are well illustrated. The most striking print in the numbers of the *Portfolio* under review is a photogravure after an early marine by Turner.

L'Art (Macmillan), in its latest issues, has felt the influence of the Exposition, and has had at the same time to render an account of the Salon, employing, as usual, by way of illustration, not only autographic copies of the pictures themselves, but also facsimiles of the painters' studies for them. At the same time it has essayed a review, which might easily make a volume, of the painters of the hundred years 1789–1889, with portraits and specimens of their work. There is a still further variety in the table of contents, which we lack the room to specify; but we will recommend the article on the lamented sculptor Longepied, who died a year ago.

According to the second annual report of the Harvard Law School Association, the membership now amounts to 816, of whom a little more than half reside in Massachusetts, 100 in New York, 49 in Ohio, 24 in Illinois, 20 in the District of Columbia, etc.—no section of the Union being unrepresented. About four times as many graduates are known to be living, and as the fees (of admission and annual) are nominal, there seems to be no reason why graduate and member should not be synonymous terms. The Treasurer is Mr. Winthrop H. Wade, 10 Tremont St., Boston. The Association offers yearly prizes for essays, and also extends pecuniary aid to the Law School, for the betterment of instruction.

The thirty-eighth meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science will be held in Toronto, beginning on August 27.

The eighth International Congress of Orientalists will assemble at Stockholm and Christiania from the 2d to the 13th of September, 1889, under the Presidency of his Majesty King Oscar of Sweden. The programme (an English edition of which has been issued by the Smithsonian Institution) presents a variety of intellectual and other treats. Membership can be secured by addressing Dr. Cyrus Adler, U. S. National Museum, Washington, D. C. The fee ($4) entitles persons desiring to attend to all the privileges of the Congress. Persons not desiring to attend, colleges and libraries will secure by subscribing a full set of the Transactions of the Congress. When offered for sale, the Transactions usually bring more for each volume than the price of the subscription. A number of American learned bodies have sent special delegates to the Congress.

—Mr. Justice Miller opens the July *Harper's* with a history of the State of Iowa and a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brief description of the character of its people and the resources of the land. The palaces of St. Petersburg give the illustrations to the Russian article, which is from the journeyman hand of Theodore Child. The eighth "Great American Industry," glass-making, is very fully described and well illustrated. The most important contribution, however, is upon the educational condition of the South, by the Rev. Atticus G. Haygood of Atlanta, Ga. The author seems to have given great attention to the subject, and reviews the state of education among black and white, the progress made in recent years, and the resources at hand for continuing the work. He considers not only the common schools, but the higher institutions. He finds very much to praise, and very much to be done in the near future, as soon as means can be provided. The growing change in public sentiment towards the schools is the most promising sign of real advance; but the case, as it is here stated, is one of such illiteracy and inadequacy in the provision made as to furnish very sorry reading. A yachting poem, "Rounding the Stakeboat," is a clever piece of versification of technical sailing terms, which, though not quite unique in our poetry, is remarkably successful. The pictures of Adriaan van de Velde give some admirable woodcuts to accompany a short sketch of the artist. Mr. Curtis writes of the times of Washington, in contrast with our own, with pertinent observations upon the different bearing of the scandals cited against the fathers from those of the present day, and pays at the end a merited tribute to the long labors of Mr. Justice Miller, a portrait of whom is the frontispiece of the number.

—A catalogue of the second and concluding part of the Barton collection in the Boston Public Library has just been printed, an interval of nine years having elapsed since Mr. Hubbard's invaluable catalogue of the Shakspere portion appeared. While the present catalogue deals with a collection of material by no means comparable for its distinction with Mr. Hubbard's (pronounced in the Shakspere *Jahrbuch* for 1880 "the best bibliographical guide to Shakespearian literature hitherto produced"), yet it has been completed in a most painstaking and creditable manner, by Mr. Carret, with the assistance of Mr. Knapp and other members of the staff. Something of historic interest attaches to the successive steps by which this library has been collected. No less than 4,000 of its volumes, on the authority of the late Dr. Wynne, formed a portion of the library of Edward Livingston, the distinguished jurist, from whom it passed to Mr. Barton, his son-in-law. This department of the collection, if the term may be allowed, is composed chiefly of works on jurisprudence, American political history and economics, with some works also on penal law. Under such headings as "Bank of the United States," "French Spoliations," "Louisiana," and the subheadings, "Tariff," and "History: War of 1812," under "United States," a fairly numerous but by no means exhaustive list of publications will be found. The reason for this, no doubt, is, that Mr. Barton's own tastes in book-collecting were, very plainly, distinctively literary, rather than historical, and that he apparently made no attempt to fill the lacunæ in these latter portions of his collection as in the former, and especially the dramatic departments. For it is an interesting fact that, even after the Shakspere portion of the library has been set aside, it still remains largely a collection of dramatic literature, ancient, mediæval, and modern. In the classical drama the principle of collection in numerous instances places side by side with the original the various versions in modern European languages. In the case of the mediæval drama the miracle plays, mysteries, and other early or rudimentary forms of the drama are represented either in original or reprinted forms. In the English drama the catalogue will be found especially valuable as a bibliographical work of reference, since the closest approach has here been made to an exhaustive representation, and the collection includes about six hundred early quarto editions, chiefly of single plays. In characterizing the collection, so far as it represented Mr. Barton's own tastes, as literary rather than historical, the further remark needs to be added that, while he apparently made no effort at amassing the materials of a working historical library, many historical works found their way into the collection whose value, however, after all, is now chiefly a literary or bibliographical one. Such, for instance, are a notable copy of DeBry's collections of voyages, the early English chronicles, and similar works of rarity.

—In execution, this work of more than six hundred pages is worthy of hearty praise. Evidently from a desire to avoid unnecessarily increasing the bulk of the volume, there has been but slight attempt at description or annotation, though contents are carefully enumerated and dates most scrupulously entered and verified. To the same desire for compactness must doubtless be attributed the purposely condensed—sometimes, indeed, blindly condensed—model observed in the entry of titles. An instance in point is the following, on page 19: "Any, rather than fail, comedy"; where we believe that few readers would grudge the extra space needed to reset it as "Any, rather than fail. A comedy." Cross-references judiciously inserted throughout the catalogue add very appreciably to its usefulness, and are in general rightly inserted. At page 437, however, the cross-reference, "Penal law. See law," should plainly be corrected to read: "See Criminal law." In one particular the catalogue (repeating the usage of Mr. Hubbard in the Shakspere portion) observes a rule which one could wish to see widely followed—namely, the placing of the paging numerals at the foot rather than at the top of the page. In a dictionary catalogue—as indeed in a dictionary or directory—the person who turns over its pages in search of a given entry finds his eye guided not by the paging, but by the alphabetical catch-words at the top of the page.

—While on the subject of the Boston Public Library, let us say that we regret to hear that only twenty copies were printed of the useful 'Index of Articles upon American Local History' of Mr. A. P. C. Griffin, which we lately noticed. Such a list would be of great use in every town library in Massachusetts, even if the libraries have not the works referred to, for it is often of service to know that something exists, and where to go for it, even if one has to go far. Every historical society in the country, also, ought to have a copy. It is true that the material has already appeared at intervals in the Bulletin of the Boston Public Library, which is to be found in most libraries, but in that form it is practically useless, and they might as well not have it. Few have patience to refer to so many different places. In fact, the money spent in printing a bibliography in small scraps is simply thrown away.

—The one leading article of *Le Livre* for May has a peculiar value in being an inventory of the catalogues available in the Bibliothèque Nationale, which has no general catalogue for its immense collection. M. E. Pierret draws it up, in an order corresponding with the several departments of the library, viz., printed books, MSS., engravings, and coins. The good that was not interred with the bones of Napoleon III. is seen in the Catalogue of French History, "publié par l'ordre de l'Empereur," whose eleven volumes, begun in 1855, were not completed till 1879, when the Republic had nearly completed its first decade. The same thing occurred with the slow-moving catalogue of the medical sciences, ordered in 1857 and finished in 1873, though in only two volumes. The oldest book catalogue appears to be that of the "Bibliothèque du Roy," published in 1739–53, in seven volumes. The newest are the continuing monthly Bulletins of recent French and foreign publications. Among the special catalogues is one of books and documents relating to America, bequeathed by the late M. Angrand; another of Baron Ch. Davillier's legacy of sale, museum, and exhibition catalogues; a third of the collection once owned by the Comte de la Bédoyère, consisting of a vast number of newspapers, historical pamphlets, satires, posters, portraits, and caricatures, assignats, autographs, etc., dating from 1787, and especially strong for the period 1789–1800. There is besides a catalogue of a Montaigne collection, and one of Victor Schoelcher's slavery collection. *Le Livre* has a laudatory notice of Prof. H. C. Bolton's 'Counting-out Rhymes of Children,' a title which the reviewer proposes to render paraphrastically thus: "Pièces rimées, sur les quelles les enfants se comptent dans leurs jeux"; and yet, as he confesses, he omits the notion expressed by *out*—the going out (*sortir*) and the being put out (*mis hors*). The French, it seems, say, like ourselves, "He's *it*" (*il l'est*). Their rhymes, however, with only one exception known to (and here cited by) the reviewer, have a show of sense.

—Viscount Melchior de Vogüé, who has lately been elected to the chair in the Académie Française made vacant by the death of M. Nisard, took his seat on the 6th of June. His speech upon his reception made a good deal of a stir in the Academy and in the French newspapers. M. de Vogüé is the youngest of the Immortals; he was born at Nice in 1848. Twelve years of his life have been spent in the diplomatic service, as attaché of the French legations at Constantinople and St. Petersburg. His six years' residence in Russia, where he married a Russian wife, the sister of Gen. Annenkoff, made him familiar with the language and literature, the knowledge and love of which have been his chief distinction. Before he gave up diplomacy for a literary life he was the author of a book of travels in the East and also a volume of 'Histoires Orientales.' Upon his return to Paris he entered seriously upon authorship, publishing a volume a year for several years in succession. His best-known book is 'Le Roman Russe," mainly a study of Tolstoi and Dostoyevsky, which appeared in the year 1886. M. de Vogüé was not the earliest of the French lovers of Russian literature, nor has he been, perhaps, the most judicious of them and the wisest, but he has done very good work, and a good deal of it, and may be said to have fairly earned his place in the Academy. Besides his books he has written much in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* and in the *Journal des Débats*.

—We said that M. de Vogüé's address has made some commotion in the newspapers. It must have stirred the Academy itself still more profoundly. M. Rousse began his reply by saying that some parts of it would doubtless

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have caused surprise to M. Nisard, if he could have been present, and would have spoiled his pleasure a little. One can well believe this, for M. Nisard was one of the oldest Academicians, and represented a past generation, while M. de Vogüé's address is probably the most modern in tone and temper that has ever been heard in the Academy. The two chief divisions of it were suggested by M. Nisard's two books, the 'Poètes de la Décadence Romaine' and the 'Littérature Française.' Latin, M. de M. de Vogüé thinks, is dying out. Forty years hence only a few "délicats" here and there will study it. The mass of men will get their classical culture through the medium of the great writers of the seventeenth century, the true inheritors of classical tradition and learning. A new generation will have grown up who will understand us little, and whom we shall not understand at all. But, whatever be the final verdict of history upon this age, at least it will be counted as a century of renascence and not of decay. So far we have no reconstructive philosophy—we have only positivism. This has done excellent work in levelling obstructions and clearing a road. It has done away with controversies by superseding them. But it is not final; it is temporary only, and an expedient. The future will have in it something much more satisfying—not the old ways of thought and the old philosophies; they never can come back—but something new. And so M. de Vogüé looks with a not unkindly eye at all modern thought, in fact, at the whole modern world, not so much because it seems to him in any wise absolutely good, but because it looks everywhere full of promise.

SKEAT'S CHAUCER.

Chaucer. The Minor Poems. Edited by the Rev. Walter W. Skeat. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1888.

Almost four hundred years went by after the death of Chaucer before anything like a satisfactory edition of his greatest work appeared. Nearly five hundred years have passed, and we witness for the first time a critical edition of his minor poems. Single pieces have indeed been brought out before, but no attempt has hitherto been made to gather together, with sufficient aids to comprehension, the shorter productions of one of the four greatest authors of our literature. The fact is a curious commentary upon the treatment which English classics have received at the hands of the English-speaking race. For a long period, in truth, it was deemed rather discreditable for a scholar who had (or who thought he had) sufficient learning to edit the most unimportant Greek or Latin text, to spend his time upon the most important work of a far greater man of his own race. When, in 1737, Dr. Morell published the initial volume of a contemplated edition of the 'Canterbury Tales,' he felt it incumbent upon him to apologize for the undertaking. "This, then," he wrote towards the end of his preface, "has been my amusement for some time, and I hope with no great detriment to the more severe and decent studies required by my place and character: I believe many a leisure hour might have been spent worse."

But though we have had to wait so long for such an edition as this, there are compensations that make up for the delay. The work has fallen into the hands of a scholar who does not feel called upon to apologize for the labor he has spent upon it, or who has been disposed to look upon it merely as the amusement of leisure hours. Prof. Skeat has brought to its preparation not only industry, interest, and enthusiasm, but wide knowledge of the early language in general and of the language of Chaucer in particular. It is this that has enabled him in several places to clear up obscurities that have defied the efforts of previous investigators to dispel, or have been passed over by them in silence. Some of the emendations are of the very happiest character. In fact, it is scarcely possible to speak in too high praise of this edition in many respects. The notes are ample, and embrace with the prefatory matter about half of the volume. In them Prof. Skeat has brought to bear upon the elucidation of the text all the great learning he has accumulated in the preparation of the various works with which his name is now so honorably connected. We have little hesitation in saying that there is no student of Chaucer living to whom this volume will not be an absolute necessity.

The book itself must therefore always be regarded as a landmark in the literary history which concerns itself with the poet. A brief analysis of its contents will give the reader a general idea of its character. It consists in the first place of 86 pages of preface, in which the editor gives a full catalogue of the pieces that have been attributed to Chaucer from the time his works were first collected in 1532, with an account of their character and an examination of the proofs of their genuineness. An enormous mass of information has here been summed up in a small space. Far as we should be from accepting every statement made in it, no one can deny its interest, its importance, or its helpfulness. In the account of the works at various times attributed to the poet we note only one error. The pieces numbered 66, 67, and 68 are mentioned as having first appeared in the folio of 1602, according to the statement quoted in the folio of 1687. We cannot say when they were first printed; but they can be found in the folio of 1598 and in that of 1561; and in the undated edition of about 1550, which now lies before us, they occupy their usual place at the end of the prefatory matter.

The poems included in this volume take up the 222 pages that follow the preface. They are twenty-three in all, three of them being placed in an appendix as having a certain character of doubtfulness. All of the undisputed minor poems are included, with the exception of the 'Legend of Good Women,' which has apparently been discarded on the ground that its length—over 2,700 lines—does not entitle it to be so considered. This reason applies with more force to the 'Troilus and Cressida,' which naturally finds here no place. This work is, indeed, often loosely classed among the minor poems of Chaucer. But a production which is nearly as long as the 'Æneid' can hardly be included under such a category with any propriety. On the other hand, Prof. Skeat adds two pieces, entitled respectively 'An Amorous Compleint' and 'A Balade of Compleynt,' that have never before been printed at all; one, entitled 'Merciless Beaute,' which has never been included previously in any edition of Chaucer's writings; and two, entitled 'Against Women Unconstant' and 'A Compleint to His Lady,' that have never been printed save in the folio editions of the poet's works, or in the collections of Anderson and Chalmers.

To balance these gains, he has excluded the prayer to the Virgin beginning "Mother of God and virgin undefouled," as being the work of Occleve. Of it he says that there is clear evidence that it was written by the pupil and not by the master. This may be so; but, whatever be the evidence that exists, the evidence that is produced can hardly be called clear. The fact that the poem is found in Occleve's handwriting does not prove of itself that it is Occleve's composition. We are not yet, in truth, in a position to pronounce decisively upon that author's works. "The Misrule," for instance, published with five other pieces in 1796 by George Mason, shows a mastery of metre on Occleve's part much superior to anything exhibited by Lydgate. Still, it is far from being up to the literary level of the "Mother of God." This poem, it may be remarked in passing, is said by Prof. Skeat to have been printed in the volume which Mason brought out in 1796. We fail to find it there, though its title is given in the preface describing the manuscript from which the selections were made.

The nearly 250 pages that follow the poems are taken up with the notes and glossary. In them will be found nearly everything essential to the full comprehension of the text. We are anxious, indeed, to express in the strongest terms the excellence of the edition as a whole, because a large share of this notice must be devoted to criticising and controverting doctrines that are earnestly advocated by its author. The result will seem, therefore, to imply a disproportionate and unintended degree of censure. It is because this work exemplifies peculiarly certain methods of investigation which have of late begun to prevail in the treatment of the text, that it is desirable to direct attention to the discussion of these general views rather than to the interpretation of particular passages. It is the more easy to do this because, while dissenting from some of the explanations given of the latter, there is very little to say of most of them but praise. When we come to the consideration of the former, however, there is frequently wide room for dissent.

For it is perfectly evident that the text of Chaucer is now going through the same process which in the last century was applied to that of Shakspere. A standard of composition, of versification, and of grammar is to be set up for the poet to which his lines must be made to conform. If they do not, the scribe can always be held responsible for the failure, just as in the case of the dramatist it was easy to take to task the actor or the type-setter. The verse is, in consequence, to be reformed to suit modern conceptions of what it ought to be, and reformed according to a theory which admits of no possible modifications. This theory, stated baldly, is, that Chaucer lived from his earliest years a life of absolute metrical, grammatical, and linguistic virtue. This life he led, too, not according to the view of this kind of virtue which he may have had himself, but according to the view which modern scholars have been induced to entertain from a study, more or less full, of the manuscripts of his works that have survived. The result is, that when his practice fails apparently to conform to their conclusions, it must by some means be set right. One result of this has been, that, in judging of his writings, the purely literary test—one of the most important of all, and in right hands the most important of all—has been practically discarded, and other and inferior ones elevated to its place.

Let us take first the matter of metre. Chaucer for a long period was spoken of as a rude and inharmonious poet, careless about the nature of his melody, careless about the character of his rhyme. This was a view begotten of ignorance and misconception, and it needs no longer to be controverted. His mastery of melodious expression places him in the front rank of English poets, in the opinion of all competent to express an opinion. The licentiousness of versification, once widely imputed to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him, was due either to inferences drawn from spurious poems, or from corrupt texts, or from lack of knowledge of the language. But there is just now a tendency to go to the other extreme. Chaucer, in this later view, is no longer the master of metre, but its slave. He does not anywhere allow himself the slightest liberty. He began a life of rigid metrical purity, and continued in it unflinchingly to the end. In no moment of carelessness, in no mood of caprice, did he wanton into the slightest deviation from the absolute precision of the versification which he had set before himself to observe. Not even was he once tempted to abandon it by the desire to produce effects of an unusual sort.

That Chaucer was generally observant of rule, that he was solicitous about the perfection of his verse, would naturally be inferred from the fact that he was a great poet. But he never turned regularity into a fetish. He reserved the right to depart from the practice he generally followed if he saw that any higher effects were to be gained by such a course. He never felt himself bound by the compulsion of a monotonous and therefore tasteless uniformity. For this fact we have his own authority. In his invocation to Apollo, at the opening of the third book of the 'House of Fame,' he asks the "god of science and of light" to make his rhyme "somewhat agreeable," even if the lines do occasionally lack a syllable. We may be sure that if some of them occasionally lacked a syllable, there were others that made up for it by occasionally having too many of them. But this is a view abhorrent to modern editors. Apollo having at any rate done his duty in making the verse agreeable, it seems to have struck Prof. Skeat that it was his duty to make it regular. It will therefore be pretty difficult to find a line in this edition which either lacks or exceeds in the duly authorized number of syllables.

No student of Chaucer will indeed deny the necessity of emendation, especially in the case of the poems written in the line of four accents. Of these the manuscripts are very few, and the few are unsatisfactory. For them it is almost impossible by any collation to furnish a text absolutely free from error. There must be emendation. About the character and extent of it there will always be room for honest and intelligent difference of opinion. Still, there is no safe rule in editing an imperfect text but the general one, that when the existing text makes fairly satisfactory sense and satisfactory metre, it is not to be altered to make it accord with certain theoretical standards of perfection which exist in the mind of the editor, but cannot be proved to have existed in the mind of the author. The result of any such procedure is sure to be harmful. We see the fact exemplified at times in this very volume. Changes are occasionally made in the text for which there is not the slightest authority in the manuscripts and for which there cannot be urged necessity, which is usually as much the devilish plea of the commentator as it is that of the tyrant. Some of these introduced readings will strike the observer from the purely literary point of view as impossible for the poet even to have contemplated.

An example or two must suffice. In the 'Book of the Duchess' the hero is represented as bewailing the death of his wife, and at the end of a series of expressions of ardent love he calls her

> "Myn hap, myn hele, and al my blisse,
> My worldes welfare and my goddesse."

There is in all this a natural climax. The intensity of the language corresponds to the intensity of the feeling. The student of poetry as poetry feels it at once. How does it appear in this edition? *Goddesse*, which is found in all the sources of the text, is, we are told, an obvious blunder. It clogs the line with an extra syllable and produces a false rhyme such as Chaucer never makes. We are furthermore gravely informed that the word *goddesse* was probably substituted for *lisse*—which means 'cessation,' 'alleviation'—because the latter was obsolescent. Accordingly, *lisse* appears in the couplet just given, though included between brackets. We need not comment upon the fact that in other instances the scribes experienced no difficulty with this obsolescent word, for as a noun or verb they found and left it half-a-dozen times in the poet's works. It is the literary rather than the linguistic sense that is struck by the alteration. Fancy a lover as the climax of an impassioned speech about his mistress describing her as his 'alleviation.'

There is just as bad an instance in the 'House of Fame,' though of a somewhat different character. In that poem mention is made of musicians that piped "in doucet and in *rede*" (variants *riede*, *ryede*)

> "That ben at festes with the brede [variants *bride*, *bryede*]."

To be at feasts with the bride is a duty to which musicians would naturally be assigned by a poet who aimed to depict both the truth and the beauty of life. But such an interpretation of the passage involves a rhyme that Prof. Skeat cannot away with. He therefore rejects *bride* in its modern sense, and substitutes for it *brede* in the sense of "roast meat." This word with this meaning is not to be found elsewhere in Chaucer, but it does occur in Old English. The scribe of the Fairfax MS., the editor tells us, has turned *brede* into *bride*, regardless of the rhyme. It is therefore not the marriage festivity which Chaucer had in mind, at which the musicians assembled. It is at feasts where roast meat is furnished. This is poetry with a vengeance. It is editing a text from the culinary point of view rather than the literary.

We should be sorry to give the impression that emendations and interpretations of the kind just given are frequent. This they are not, and in the poems written with lines of five accents illustrations of such a sort could hardly be found at all. But the undue magnifying of rhyming and metrical tests has had a reflex influence. The editor has added to the list of Chaucer's works certain pieces. These he believes to have been his composition, not because they have literary value—which they can hardly be said to have—nor even because they are contained in manuscripts along with other productions that are well known to be the work of the poet. It is clear that the supreme determining reason in his mind for attributing them to him is the fact that they conform perfectly to certain metrical tests. We cannot affirm, indeed, because a poem is a poor one that therefore it was not written by a great author. Still, justice to a great author demands that he shall not be saddled with the reputation of begetting every ordinary production floating about in his time merely because its rhymes are correct and there can be found for it no other reputable parentage. In speaking of one of his additions, 'An Amorous Complaint, made at Windesor,' the editor triumphantly remarks: "If he did not write it, we may well ask who did?" This is a singular argument to come from a scholar who has been most urgent in maintaining the spuriousness of poems, long attributed to Chaucer, which are far superior to anything written by any of his avowed disciples, and are not unworthy of even his genius.

Now, we venture to assert that Chaucer was never so particular about the observance of verse tests, rhyme tests, dialect tests, as his editors have come to be for him, and that while it is perfectly legitimate to affirm that he generally followed certain practices, it is impossible to maintain that he did not deviate from them occasionally. Let us take for illustration the use of Northern dialectic forms which Prof. Skeat has more than once insisted upon as an argument against the genuineness of the existing version of the 'Romaunt of the Rose.' There is little doubt that Chaucer, especially in his earlier work, was to some extent under the influence of that dialect. It was natural that he should be. In the region where it was spoken he spent a portion of his life. It was inevitable that he should become more or less familiar with it, and, being familiar with it, that on occasions he should resort to its forms. The fact we can see illustrated in his employment of several words that belong specially to that dialect. But far more striking is his use of one of its most remarkable grammatical peculiarities. This is in the formation of the third person singular of the present tense of the verb. In the North this ended regularly in *-s*. In the Midland dialect, in which Chaucer wrote, it ended just as regularly in *-th*. Never once did the poet use the form in *-s* in the 'Legend of Good Women,' in the 'Canterbury Tales,' or in fact in any production written in the line of five accents. We of course exclude corruptions that can be found in particular manuscripts which the comparison of other manuscripts shows conclusively to have been foisted in by the copyists. But this Northern form does occur in the 'Book of the Duchess' and in the 'House of Fame.' In them it is not due to any blunder for which the scribe can be held responsible: it is absolutely essential to the rhyme; it is therefore the work of the poet. In the first of these two productions *telles* rhymes with *elles* (lines 73-4), and *falles* with *halles* (lines 257-8). In the second *elles* again rhymes with *telles* (lines 425-6). In the latter poem also another peculiar grammatical form of the Northern dialect is found. This is the second person singular in *-s* instead of *-st*. In lines 1907-8 *tydinges* can be found rhyming with *bringes*. The editor, so far from commenting upon these dialectical peculiarities, makes not even the slightest allusion to them, so far as we can discover. Yet were the genuineness of the poems in question, it is safe to say that no one would point with more confidence to these same rhymes as positive proof that the pieces containing them could not have been the production of Chaucer himself.

We find the same difference between author and commentator in the comparative deference paid to rigid rule in the matter of rhymes depending upon grammar. Prof. Skeat assures us in this volume, with great positiveness, as he has done on several other occasions, that Chaucer never rhymes a weak past participle with a weak preterite. It is a point, he informs us, upon which the poet was very particular. Accordingly, in a previous work, he changed *he wente* in line 534 of the Second Nun's tale into *is went* on the authority of a single manuscript, and that an inferior one, against the authority of all the others that have been printed. Now, that this sort of rhyme is comparatively rare in Chaucer can be conceded; but that in this respect he had not attained to the pitch of linguistic and metrical virtue of his editors is quite as certain. In the 'Legend of Good Women' he rhymes the preterite *heryede* with the past participial form *beryed*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(lines 787-8). In lines 2384-5 of the same poem he rhymes the past participle *served* with the preterit *deservede*. Even in the poem included in the present volume, the 'Parliament of Foules,' the weak verb *broughte* rhymes with the weak past participle *y-wrought* (lines 121-3), though the latter appears in this edition as *y-wroghte*, a form which has at best the authority of but two out of a dozen manuscripts that have been printed. We have not exhausted the illustrations that could be given, but they are enough to establish the point.

Equally unfounded, it seems to us, are some of the editor's contentions in his preface. He is very positive, in the two following lines from the passage in which Lydgate gives a list of Chaucer's works,

> "He wrote also full many a day agon
> Dant in English, himself doth so expresse,"

that the 'House of Fame' is the translation of Dante which is here mentioned, if indeed we can employ so large a word as "translation" as the equivalent of Lydgate's phrase. Still, that the 'House of Fame' is meant is perfectly clear to him, though he admits that he can find no one else who seems to have thought of it. We are disposed to go further and maintain that he is the only one who will ever think it. The obligations of Chaucer to Dante in this poem have been absurdly overrated by German scholars, but the views expressed here exceed anything that has as yet been formulated. A far more satisfactory explanation of Lydgate's remark can easily be given. His only authority, indeed, for the assertion is the assertion of the poet. "Himself doth so express," he tells us. But in the sense in which such a statement would now be understood, Chaucer never said anything of the sort, so far as we have any evidence. In the sense in which the statement would probably then have been understood, he did say so. He did versify lines from Dante, he quoted him once or twice by name. It is reasonable to suppose that the passages avowedly taken from him and the references to him are all that Lydgate had in mind. There are many reasons to believe that the word 'translation' was then used in a far looser sense than now, and that translating an author meant sometimes little more than translating from him.

Lack of space compels us to omit the discussion of several other points to which the statements in this volume give rise. We are far from wishing to be understood as undervaluing the importance of these tests, upon which Prof. Skeat, in common with many German scholars, lays so much stress. It is the exalting them to supreme dignity from the subsidiary position in which they hold an honorable place, that calls for vigorous exception. It is the representation, that is objectionable, of the poet as servilely submitting to rules having in the nature of things no binding authority, but which neither temptation nor provocation nor the chance of securing better results could induce him in a single instance to disobey. But these differences of opinion do not hinder us from recognizing the exceeding merits of this work and the excellence of the editorial labor that has been devoted to its preparation. These will speak for themselves to the student upon every page, and we cannot better close our notice than with the renewed assertion that to every one who wishes to make himself familiar with the writings of the first great poet of English literature, the possession of this volume is an absolute necessity.

RECENT NOVELS.

Passe Rose. By Arthur Sherburne Hardy. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Greifenstein. By F. Marion Crawford. Macmillan & Co.

Far in the Forest. By T. Weir Mitchell, M. D. J. B. Lippincott Co.

The Pretty Sister of José. By Frances Hodgson Burnett. Charles Scribner's Sons.

The Witness of the Sun. By Amélie Rives. J. B. Lippincott Co.

On first thought one is tempted to say that the most remarkable thing about 'Passe Rose' is its experimental boldness; but, on reflection, the justification of that boldness by complete success is more surprising still. In the beginning of the century there would have been neither risk nor rashness in selecting for a scene the forest of Ardennes, when Charlemagne, resting from battle, kept court beneath its shade. Then people did not realize the worthlessness of works of the imagination in which imagination is perceptible, and revelled in the bliss of their ignorance: then the air was ringing with the song of romantic poets; then Sir Walter Scott was busily conferring immortality on kings and queens long dead, and on all the splendor that had died with them, little dreaming that he was doing a most wicked thing, and that in wiser and more righteous times a voice would be heard crying from an American Republic to lay bare his iniquity. Fortunately for the literature of that Republic, 'Passe Rose' was written before the American father had been warned against that pernicious old tuft-hunter, Sir Walter, and solemnly urged to impress upon his children the insidious evil lurking in those apparently harmless nursery tales which uninformed generations have been accustomed to call novels, collectively, the Waverley novels. Mr. Hardy might have dared to disregard instruction in insignificant matters of form and method, even to fly in the face of authority; but the bare suspicion that he was about to abet base designs on the political faith of his country would surely have stayed his hand. However, what is done cannot be undone, and we have got, by the skin of our teeth, as it were, a story of uncommon beauty, all about people whose eyes turned to the King as the sunflower turns to its god—a king, too, whose kingdom was won by the sword, and bound together by the shackles of the slave, from the Elbe to the Ebro and from the North Sea to the Adriatic.

To Passe Rose the divinity of the King was no more questionable than that of the saints, and the delights of his court were more seductive than those of Paradise, probably because to a girl of her spirit they seemed more surely attainable. Passe Rose is herself a creature of delight. Nobody's child, she dances along through wood and town, in the wake of barbarian armies, at the tail of merchant caravans, seizing the joy of to-day and careless of to-morrow's sorrow. A gold-beater of Maestricht finds her asleep by the roadside, and takes the pretty thing, in her tawdry costume of Folly, home to his good wife, who adopts her as a gift from God. Thus far Passe Rose is so perfectly imagined that we fear the future. Is she to be reformed by respectability with a thoroughness that shall discredit every lesson of human experience? Is she to develop a strain of coarseness, or dissolute propensity, the worst possible effects of childish vagabondism? Or, disaster dire and most probable, will she straightway begin to live, move, and breathe with self-conscious rectitude, torturing herself into conformity with an entirely modern standard of propriety? Into any of these pits a slight dimness or deflection of vision might easily have led the author. His sight was clear and true: so Passe Rose goes dancing on, in sun and shower, requiting love with loyalty, quick and ruthless in resentment of injury or offence, truthful when she may be, dissembling when she must, and most resolute to get whatever she strongly craves. She lives with all her might, and we have always a woman before our eyes, never an isolated faculty or part acting independently of the whole.

One such character as Passe Rose is enough to give rank to a novel; but her position is not that of the star actress who is at once exalted and belittled by incompetent support. Great lady and peasant woman, knight and monk, each is given a part so well adapted to his nature that spontaneously he could play no other. The Saxon, Rothilde, a traitor among traitors, has enough unscrupulous cruelty and utter selfishness to accomplish her treachery, had not circumstances thwarted her; and again, had not fate been kind, Brother Dominic's vast vanity must surely have hurled him to perdition. The Prior, Sergius, is dominated by that worldly ambition which gives the lie to professions of holiness, and the Abbot, Rainal, is possessed of that holiness which makes itself felt without profession. By the grace of imagination, the gift of God, and of scholarship and technical skill, the rewards of hard labor, Mr. Hardy has written a rarely perfect story, combining the undying and inexplicable charm of a fairy tale with the definable merits of the best fiction that deals with actual life and human character.

The American who reads 'Greifenstein' close upon 'Passe Rose' may well tremble for the Republic, and sorrowfully reflect that its novelists have conspired for its destruction. The feudal aloofness of 'Greifenstein' takes the democratic breath away. Two baronial castles share the action, castles amply supplied with mediæval necessaries, such as turrets, battlements, and donjon keeps. The castles are perched on all but inaccessible crags in the gloomy heart of the Black Forest of Swabia, and are of an antiquity little less high and hoary than that of the crags and the fir trees. The inhabitants of the castles are the noble remnant of noble lines, and though the Sigmundskrons are extremely poor, and the Greifensteins extremely rich, the former have the consolation of a flawless family honor, stretching backwards for a thousand years to Sigmund the Volsung, while on the escutcheon of the latter there is just a little speck. This little speck has a terrible power of expansion, and magnifies itself into a black cloud of crime which swallows the nobility of the Greifensteins, and effaces their name for ever. The crime perpetrated in Greifenstein castle by two most high-born gentlemen would perhaps appear more probable if it were ascribed to two unshaven anarchists in a beer cellar; but no scene or actors could modify its atrocity.

Guarding against general incredulity, Mr. Crawford, before entering on the narration, excuses it by the assertion that what he has to tell is not fiction, but fact. With the excuse he is in a worse predicament than without it, for, granting that somewhere, at some time, two strong men saw fit to strangle a silly, helpless, tawdry old woman, human judgment, to which Mr. Crawford appeals, rejects the deed as impossible to two men of the character, breeding, and experience attributed by him to Count von Greifenstein and his half-brother, Von Rieseneck. When the narration of a tragedy fails to inspire that horror which is the intrinsic property of tragedy, then there is a false note either in the conception or their execution. In this case we have Mr. Crawford's word that he is responsible only for the execution, for the description of actors in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tragedy, and of the way they brought it about. When the punishment of the wicked fails to fill the righteous with satisfaction, and, on the contrary, excites contemptuous indignation against those who have taken upon themselves the office of avengers, then, for all moral and for all artistic purposes, the punishment of the wicked is profitless and a bald atrocity.

The great Greifenstein crime is enacted early in the history, and the difficulties of keeping excitement up to such a pitch are obvious. The author wrestles with these difficulties sternly and overcomes them gallantly. The sins of the fathers are visited on the children with Judaic severity, and their dreadful, complicated secrets keep leaking out at most critical moments, threatening to blast every sweet hope and joy of the later generation. As a woman ruined the two fathers, so, by a beautiful, poetic sense of contrast with which fate is not often credited, a woman saves the two sons. There is nothing in the way of averting impending calamity of which Hilda, the last fair flower of the Volsung stock, is incapable. Her mere presence revives her lover, the young Greif, when already the death-rattle is heard in his throat, and her heroic common sense saves him later from an irretrievable folly which, if committed, would have sent the noble Sigmundskrons to join the Greifensteins in dishonorable extinction. Essentially 'Greifenstein' is no more than a very cheap sensational romance; and it is only in the unaffected, easy-going style that we recognize a sane and reputable novelist. The high-born ones do not habitually ask the time of day with an elegance of manner which at once proclaims their long descent; they are not constantly quaffing priceless wines from jewel-studded beakers, nor do they use bank-notes for kindling, but, in spirit and in deed, they are the great people of the chromo fiction and of the mob the best-beloved.

The title of Dr. Mitchell's 'Far in the Forest' is not misleading. The pages echo the music of rustling leaves and chattering brooks, and at times reflect that melancholy which sits brooding in wooded solitudes. The wilderness in which the scene is laid has none of the attractions or advantages for a story-teller possessed by the forests of Ardennes and Swabia. The horn of courtly huntsman never sounded down its glades, the shock of battle never wounded its silence. No elf or fay ever meditated mischief beneath its "murmuring pines and hemlocks." It is an innocent American forest, quite without experience, and having accumulated through all its centuries no more knowledge than that its leaves bud and fall and bud again, and that the rivers are always hurrying by, but never getting away. In such a scene, if anywhere, total exclusion of the perilous aristocratic element might be expected, yet the hero of the story is a German, a baron, and he is the hero by virtue of qualities inherited from ancestors who had the habit of command and of self-control. Riverius is indeed more attached to ideas than to traditions, but his ideas alone would never have excited the suspicion and hatred of the aggressively free and independent lumbermen, nor brought about the culminating tragedy. The mere presence of Riverius as a power in the camps implies a coming tragedy, and when it comes, it is the natural result of all that has gone before—an inevitable catastrophe. The figures of the well-tutored German and of the ungoverned woodsmen are well contrasted, are solid and vigorous, but lack the touch of vivid life which a lighter and freer style than Dr. Mitchell's might have given them. Elizabeth Preston, too, is heavy, and, till the last moment, rather negative and uninteresting; but in the child of an actress and the blind giant Philetus we have a charming baby, with subtle indications of the eternal woman. All the characters, however, contribute something to the clearly conceived plot, and none could have been omitted without loss to the dramatic intensity of the last chapters.

Between the actual life of times present or past and that represented in Mrs. Burnett's 'Pretty Sister of José,' the resemblance is microscopic. The pretty sister has flirted and pirouetted and warbled through innumerable operettas. A satisfactory synopsis of her history could be made by judicious selection and arrangement of those sheets of thin white paper, much decorated in blue, which lie between the wood and the fruit of boxes of raisins imported from Malaga. There is imprinted, and there has been imprinted from time out of mind, the pretty sister in short skirts and mantilla, with the deep-red rose in her hair, flirting her fan or thrumming her mandolin; there are the vine-clad cot and the leathery-faced grandmother busied about pots and pans which doubtless smell strongly of garlic; there is the supremely beautiful matador, proudly advancing, and there are the arena and the bull and a promiscuous multitude of mantillas and moustaches and red roses and brigand hats. Now, the only question that arises is whether the matador will conquer the pretty sister, so haughty of mien and cold of heart—for, of course, the bull is doomed. By the pictorial method of reading the story, one could answer according to his degree of ingenuity, and he who should show less than Mrs. Burnett would be dull indeed. There are novelists in Spain to-day who are neglecting the mantilla and mandolin, the matador and the bull, and Mrs. Burnett's well-meant intention may have been to jog the national memory and to protest against deliberate consignment to oblivion of so much picturesqueness.

Doubtless the sun, in the course of its shining, has been obliged to endure passively much that a less well-regulated planet, or, let us say, a planet with more of free-will, would have flown out at and publicly denounced. But Miss Rives goes too far. The sun never saw those things she calls upon it to witness and suffered them to be. It is a mad world, but were it half so mad as Miss Rives represents it, the sun, the stars, and all the celestial bodies would start from their spheres to demolish it, and chaos would be come again. No, the sun never shone on the land Miss Rives describes, and God never made the creatures that there abide. Ouida created all. Hers is that land of the ilex and laurel, of the palm and the pomegranate, the olive and almond, all growing together in perpetual blossom—hers and no other's. Hers are the crumbling marble temple and the fallen pagan God, with red rose leaves staining his polished limbs, like "drops of fragrant blood." Hers, most unquestionably of all, are the creatures, "neither man nor woman, neither beast nor human," who love madly, hate venomously, and intrigue vilely in the fair estate provided for their delectable pursuits and performances. By the force of a corrupt yet ardent imagination, by the license of total indifference to common decency, and by considerable observation of varied forms of human depravity, Ouida was able to throw that *verve* into her work which made her famous and her novels infamous. Lady novelists ambitious of rivalling her, and lacking any of her qualifications in their full perfection, can only make their books ridiculous and expose themselves to the jeers of the vulgar. Miss Rives, on the whole, falls far short of her model. She takes herself most seriously, not to say solemnly, but there is no salvation in that. Yet there are indications that her ambition is not quite vain, and even instances of the disciple's equality with the master. The Ouida version of the classics contains nothing more surprising than the conversion of Æneas into a "celebrated Greek.' Among her host of literary geniuses we remember none more gifted than Miss Rives's Nadrovine, and none of a physical force comparable to that of this incendiary Russian, who was so well preserved that "at twenty-nine his light-brown curls were as free from any tinge of gray as they had been seven years before." Finally, in the Ouida collection of curiosities, by her called mothers, there is no such rare specimen as Madame Nadrovine. Miss Rives, in dwelling upon the quality of a mother's love for her only son, has wrought herself into a species of frenzy, and poured such floods of light on the elements of the maternal passion and its possible expression, that the ordinary mother may blush with shame for her guilty inadequacy. To be wise for her son, self-sacrificing and tender is nothing. She must chain him to her by the seduction of the senses, by burning caresses, by words that tear away the artificial barriers set up between men and women by theories about modesty and propriety. To insure what she believes to be her son's welfare, she must concoct schemes that involve her own degradation, and, above all things, she must not forget to prove her self-abnegation by tramping about the country after him in unbuttoned boots. Any mother who, beguiled from the path of duty by the leisure of a long railway journey, should employ that leisure in buttoning her boots, would fall contemptibly below the standard for mothers set by Madame Nadrovine.

A RECONSTITUTED LATIN GRAMMAR.

A Grammar of the Latin Language, for the Use of Schools and Colleges. By E. A. Andrews and S. Stoddard. Revised by Henry Preble. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 8vo, pp. xii, 453.

THE appearance of a new Latin grammar would not, under ordinary circumstances, call for any extended notice. Still less would the publication of a "revised edition" of a well-known school-book demand attention. But there are some things connected with both the old and the new editions of 'Andrews and Stoddard's Latin Grammar' a knowledge of which will be useful to some of our readers, and perhaps interesting to all.

The first edition of the work was published in Boston, by the old firm of Crocker & Brewster, in 1836. During the last half century it has been used in the schools and colleges of the United States more than any other Latin grammar, perhaps more than all others combined. During the half-century preceding 1836, 'Adam's Latin Grammar' had been used in almost every school, public and private, in which the Latin language was taught. In all that time it had remained unchanged. The boys who hurrahed for Jackson learned their Latin in the same way and out of the same book as the boys who gazed with awe upon George Washington. When Andrews and Stoddard's grammar appeared, its success was as astonishing as it was deserved. In the twenty years succeeding its first publication, sixty-four editions were issued, and before the end of that period Adam's grammar lived only on the shelves of libraries and in the memories of men who had studied it in their youth. No substantial change was made in these rapidly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appearing editions. Manifest errors were corrected, slight changes in phraseology and some small additions were made, especially in the forty-sixth edition, which appeared in 1854; but in all important particulars the sixty-fourth edition was like the first.

In the meantime, the progress in every department of philology had been enormous. Many rival grammars had appeared and were competing sharply for public favor. Prof. Stoddard was dead, but Dr. Andrews recognized the fact that, if their grammar was to maintain the high position it had acquired, he must bring it more into harmony with advanced ideas. He did not wish, and had he wished, he would probably have been unable, to make a new grammar materially different from the old one. He was essentially a scholar of the old school, and the wonderful success of his book was due, not to the introduction of any new system, but to the accuracy and completeness with which he had carried the old system out. The grammar as originally published offended no deep-seated prejudices, violated no long-established customs, ran counter to no ancient traditions. Andrews and Stoddard's grammar was a lineal descendant of Adam's, but the public had said of it what Hector prayed the gods might be said of his son:

. . . πατρός γ' ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων.

Dr. Andrews gave the sixty-fifth edition of his grammar, which appeared in 1857, a thorough revision. He brought to the accomplishment of his task a very minute and accurate knowledge of the details of the Latin language. He had published in 1845 a school dictionary of the Latin language, and in 1850 his extensive Latin-English Lexicon based upon the Latin-German dictionary of Freund. During the years devoted to the preparation of these works he had noticed such points as he supposed would be useful to him in a revision of the Grammar. All these resources were brought into play, and when, in 1857, the sixty-fifth edition appeared, it was enlarged by more than a fifth of its original size. But the identity of the book was not destroyed. The plan and construction remained the same. The division into sections and their numbering remained unchanged. The same subjects were treated under the same heads and in the same manner; the chief difference consisted in the addition of a mass of details the utility of which was perhaps disproportionate to the space they occupied. The sixty-fifth edition was the first filled in, corrected, and extended. Teachers who had used the earlier editions changed without difficulty to the use of the new one. They could refer their pupils to the same section for the explanation of a point with the utmost confidence that, though the explanation might be fuller and clearer, yet it would not be inconsistent with what they themselves had learned years before. During the thirty years which followed the publication of the new and revised edition the Grammar continued to be extensively used — probably more extensively than any one grammar of the Latin language, but not, as for several years it had been, more extensively than all other Latin grammars combined.

But the book was fast becoming antiquated. Its lack of harmony with the principles of modern philology and the modern methods of teaching language was every year becoming more apparent. The publishers and owners of the copyright were aware of this, and they called upon Prof. Preble to attempt the task of rejuvenation. The result is before us, and we think it may without exaggeration be summed up as follows: On the back of the book is printed 'Andrews and Stoddard's Latin Grammar'; the first part of the title-page reads, as of old, "A Grammar of the Latin Language for the use of Schools and Colleges"—and that is about all there is to identify the work. The volume is taller and wider and has more pages; the paper is finer and whiter, the type is larger and clearer, it is in all respects handsomer. It is printed at a different press, by a different process, and by a different firm. The original authors and owners of the copyright have long since gone to their rest. The property in the copyright has passed to their legal representatives, and, as if to emphasize the contrast, these, five in number, are, with the exception of the publishers, all women. The division of the work into sections and their numbering has nothing in common with the old grammar. In that the syntax commenced at §200, in the new one it begins at §309. The text of the work has not been revised; it has been rewritten and rearranged. Had Prof. Preble published the work as it stands, under the title 'A New Grammar of the Latin Language,' omitting all reference to Andrews and Stoddard, we do not believe any reviewer would have accused him of plagiarism, nor could any suit for infringement of copyright have been brought against his publishers with any chance of success. Profs. Andrews and Stoddard began, as they tell us in their original preface, with the intention of preparing a revised edition of 'Adam's Latin Grammar,' but abandoned that intention and produced a new work. Prof. Preble began with the intention of preparing a revised edition of 'Andrews and Stoddard's Grammar,' and he has given us a new work without formally abandoning his original intention. The book is a new one, and, as such, we will point out, in the limited space at our command, a few of the many points in which it differs from the old grammar.

The pronunciation of the Latin language, as taught in 'Andrews and Stoddard's Grammar,' was that known as the "English method," and it had been in use for several generations in all English and American schools. The authors did not pretend to anything new, except in their manner of presenting it. On this they prided themselves, and it was as effectual as could be devised. But in 1857, when Dr. Andrews published the revised edition of his Grammar, the revolt against the "English method" had become a rebellion, and the rebellion gave strong promise of becoming a revolution. The only concession, however, which he made to the new practices was to print in brackets a table of the sounds of the vowels according to what was called the "Continental method," and to append to the directions for pronouncing the letter *c* the remark in fine print: "In the pronunciation of the ancient Romans, the hard sound of *c* and *g* seems to have been retained in all their combinations." The method actually taught in the revised Grammar was the same as in the old. That method not only converted the language into a gibberish which would have shocked Cicero and Virgil, and which was unintelligible to the Latinists of all other countries, but it violated all the phonic laws of the language, and rendered their explanation impossible. But its evil effects were not confined to Latin. The "English method" was applied to Greek as well, and we recognize in this absurd way of pronouncing the classical languages one of the chief reasons why England has lagged so far behind Germany in the science of comparative philology.

Prof. Preble has made short work with the "English method." He has tossed it overboard as so much rubbish. In the Grammar he has not noticed it even as matter of history. In his preface he briefly refers to it merely to let us know what has become of it and save us the trouble of looking for it. As to the "Continental method" of pronouncing Latin, Prof. Preble does not mention it. The phrase was always ill-chosen and misleading. In the pronunciation of the simple vowels there was always a substantial uniformity throughout continental Europe. In all other respects there were marked differences in the different nations. No method existed. A Frenchman said Sisero, a German Tsitsero, an Italian Tchitchero; and Cicero himself would have told each of them that he was not acquainted with any person of that name. The system adopted by Prof. Preble is the one now universally admitted by the best scholars to represent most nearly the actual pronunciation of the ancient Romans. Latin thus pronounced would have been intelligible to the Roman Senate in the days of Cicero, and that is more than can be said of the burlesque which still lingers in most English and many American schools and colleges.

Prof. Preble has adopted throughout his work the plan of marking the long vowels, and has rightly insisted upon the distinction between long vowels and long syllables. The first syllable in *captus* is, for the purposes of versification, long; but the vowel *a* in that syllable is not and was not pronounced as a long vowel either in verse or prose. For reasons which we have no room to give, we think it would have been better to have left unmarked those vowels which he has marked as "common" and directed to be pronounced short in prose. Neither have we any room to explain and defend another opinion, of the truth of which we are profoundly convinced, namely, that most of the "rules of quantity" which occupy so large a space in all our Latin grammars should be sent after the "English method" of pronunciation.

The subject of the inflection of words of course occupies a large part of this, as of every other Latin grammar. Prof. Preble's treatment of it is a great improvement on the old grammar. It takes the learner along the road marked out by comparative philology, perhaps as fast and as far as either pupils or teachers are at present able or willing to go.

Of the syntax it may be said generally that, as compared with the old grammar, it aims more at explanation and illustration, and depends less upon the reduction of everything to fixed and rigid rules. The treatment of the subjunctive mood affords an apt illustration. In the original grammar this part of syntax occupied twelve pages; in the revised edition of 1857 it had grown to sixteen; Prof. Preble gives it fifty. But it is evident from what he says in his preface, and from occasional remarks in the text of the Grammar, that he depends not so much on formal statements as on the number and fitness of the passages which he cites from the classical writers. These passages he has arranged in parallel columns. In one column are sentences with a verb in the indicative; in the other, sentences in other respects similar in construction, but with the verb in the subjunctive. Then, by a careful translation, he has endeavored to bring out the distinction between the two. This is a very good method, but we think it might be improved. In many of these sentences the subjunctive might be substituted for the indicative or vice versa, and the sentence would still remain grammatical and intelligible. No doubt this change of mood makes the author say something more or less different from what he actually did

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say. But that is the very point which the learner needs and desires to see brought out, and it can hardly be brought out in any other way than by a comparison of sentences identical in all respects except in the mood of the verb.

Prof. Preble gives about thirty pages to the subject of versification, treating it according to the method of Dr. J. H. H. Schmidt, the general adoption of which seems to be only a question of time. On the whole, the new grammar is much more in accordance with the results of modern scholarship and the modern methods of teaching than the old. Teachers who have been accustomed to the latter will probably find it easier to use this new one than they would one constructed without any special reference to Andrews and Stoddard's. The prestige which the old grammar still enjoys will to some extent smooth the way for the introduction of the new one. But the time has gone by for any such phenomenal success as attended the publication of the original work; the rivals are too numerous and too excellent.

Reports on Elementary Schools, 1852-1882. By Matthew Arnold. Edited by the Rt. Hon. Sir Francis Sandford, K.C.B. Macmillan & Co. 1889.

Mr. Arnold's inspection of schools was no inconsiderable portion of his life work. Besides his tours of observation on the Continent, with the fruits of which educators have long been familiar, his services at home, extending from 1851 to 1886, covered his mature life continuously, and the more general portions of his successive Reports are reprinted in this volume. He was, from the start, an advocate of culture, of forming rather than informing the mind, and his long observation strengthened him in his opinion. In 1852 he expresses himself, in connection with the subject of pupil-teachers, as "much struck, in examining them towards the close of their apprenticeship, when they are generally at least eighteen years old, with the utter disproportion between the great amount of positive information and the low degree of mental culture and intelligence they exhibit. . . . I cannot but think that with a body of young men so highly instructed, too little attention has hitherto been paid to this side of education; the side through which it chiefly forms the character; the side which has perhaps been too exclusively attended to in schools for the higher classes, and to the development of which it is the boast of what is called classical education to be mainly directed." This is the text upon which a large proportion of the remaining Reports expand. Twenty years later he declares "the great fault" of elementary instruction to be that it "at most gives to a child the mechanical possession of the instruments of knowledge, but does nothing to *form* him." He regards this distinction as marking the barrier between the education of the upper and lower classes.

In matters of detail he pleads hard for the study of grammar. He praises it as an "exact" study, most useful at a period when a child's mind is naturally vague in its workings. "Grammar," he says, "is an exercise of the children's wits; all the rest of their work is in general but an exercise of their memory. To learn the definitions and rules of grammar is, indeed, but an exercise of memory, but, after learning the definition of a noun, to recognize nouns when one meets with them, and to refer them to their definition, that is an exercise of intelligence." For this reason he recommends the study of Latin, as well as in order to give a child a *second* language, which of itself is an incalculable benefit. He puts forth in connection with this his singular suggestion of a Latin text-book made up from the Vulgate, to the entire disregard of classical Latin. He objects very strongly to the system under which the efforts of the schools were directed to pass examination in fixed books, since it tended to make the mastery of these the only aim; the classes could read fluently what they had practised long, but could not read a new simple passage from another book with the same readiness. To examinations in general he had a hardly veiled dislike, so far as they were restricted to testing acquisitions of knowledge instead of acquisitions of power; the strain on the mind, he says, is much greater in storing up knowledge passively to be reproduced in examination than it is in any active mental work in which the mind itself contributes a share. He acknowledges, as all must, that the end of elementary education is primarily to give the power of reading, writing, and casting accounts. Of these the first is most important, but in 1878 he asserts that it "may be doubted whether this is not given more seldom" than the other two; "it is bestowed in much fewer cases than we imagine"; and he adds here and in other passages excellent advice on the matter of reading-books. He especially warns elementary teachers that Pestalozzi and other reformers are not to be too much yielded to; and humorously says that the result of these new systems is that "one sees a teacher holding up an apple to a gallery of little children, and saying, 'An apple has a stalk, peel, pulp, core, pips, and juice; it is odorous and opaque, and is used for making a pleasant drink called cider.'" He enumerates the branches necessary for children from eight to ten, as "reading, writing, arithmetic, poetry or poetic literature, grammar, geography, *Naturkunde*, and music." Other things, such as needlework, domestic economy, cookery, technical instruction, gymnastics, and drill, however important or necessary, and however the code may mix them up with mental training, should be kept by the teacher resolutely separate from it.

He seems to have been perpetually struck by the small vocabulary of the children. In one school of seventy children, in 1874, which had annual grants and pupil-teachers, "there was not one single child who knew the meaning of the word *feeble*." In 1880 he reports from London schools of children of twelve years who were able to pass well in reading, writing, and arithmetic, that they did not know what a *steed* was, and in a head class of thirty only one knew what a *ford* was. "I have ceased to feel surprise at any failure of that kind," he says, "so thoroughly has experience convinced me of the excessive scantiness of vocabulary, which is the rule amongst our school-children. It is the signal feature of their mental condition, and constitutes their real inferiority to the children of the cultivated classes." Scantiness of vocabulary means, of course, scantiness of ideas. In another school he reports that "not one child in the upper class had ever heard of the Stuarts, had ever heard of Charles the First, had ever heard that a King of England had had his head cut off." This was a girls' school, well-dressed, well-behaved, with high fees, age from eleven to thirteen. For defects of vocabulary, of mechanical education, and, in general, the worst features of the system, he continually recommends that poetry or poetic literature be made a part of the curriculum, or more attended to. He observes that the great merit of the system of classical education was that it brought the mind constantly in contact with masterpieces of literature; he thinks this should be done in English education also. He recommends Scott, provided the extract contains the climax of the interest, Gray's "Elegy," and some of Mrs. Hemans's short pieces for being committed to memory. The conditions of choice are that the poem "should have real beauties of expression and feeling, that these beauties should be such as the children's hearts and minds can lay hold of, and that a distinct point or centre of beauty and interest should occur within the limits of the passage learnt." He asserts, controverting Sir John Lubbock's report that science was the most popular study among the children, that by his observation poetry was most interesting. The high value he placed upon it is most fully expressed in the following passage:

"The acquisition of good poetry is a discipline which works deeper than any other discipline in the range of work of our schools; more than any other, too, it works of itself, is independent of the school-teacher, and cannot be spoiled by pedantry and injudiciousness on his part. Some people regard my high estimate of the value of poetry in education with suspicion and displeasure. Perhaps they may accept the testimony of Wordsworth with less suspicion than mine. Wordsworth says: 'To be incapable of a feeling of poetry, in my sense of the word, is to be without love of human nature and reverence for God.' And it is only through acquaintance with poetry, and good poetry, that this 'feeling of poetry' can be given. Good poetry does undoubtedly tend to form the soul and character; it tends to beget a love of beauty and truth in alliance together; it suggests, however indirectly, high and noble principles of action, and it inspires the emotion so helpful in making principles operative. Hence its extreme importance to all of us."

It should be said, however, that the extent to which poetry then entered into the studies of the schools was the memorizing and reciting of from one to two hundred lines. We give space to this suggestion because it is preëminently the main one which was enforced upon Arnold by his long and intimate acquaintance with the workings of elementary schools.

The Reports gain by being written in a more sober and unrhetorical style than belongs usually to this brilliant writer, and they are interesting from the number of minor topics of a practical nature touched upon. Those interested in education will find much of immediate value in the series, apart from the general view and the broad literary temperament which give its principal value. The attempt to raise the common schools to the plane of real mental cultivation of the old academies seems less hopeless after reading the volume, but the gap between the two systems is made too clear for comfort.

The Coming of the Friars, and Other Historic Essays. By the Rev. Augustus Jessopp, D.D., author of 'Arcady: for Better for Worse,' etc. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1889. 8vo, pp. 344.

For several years past, students of social life in the Middle Ages have welcomed from time to time in the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* these graphic and instructive papers by Dr. Jessopp, based upon the original study of out-of-the-way documents, which we have before us at last gathered in a handsome volume. The papers are seven in number; besides that which gives a title to the volume, there are, "Village Life in East Anglia Six Hundred Years Ago," "Daily Life in a Mediæval Monastery," "The Black Death in East Anglia" (two papers), "The Building Up of a University," and "The Prophet of Walnut-Tree Yard." Taken together, they present a picture of the life and social environment of our ancestors—and East Anglia was peculiarly the home of the New England colonists—such as we believe cannot anywhere else be found. We know no-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing to compare with it except Pauly's 'Pictures of Old England'; and Pauly, if a greater scholar than Dr. Jessopp, did not possess his direct personal interest in and associations with his subject.

Of these papers the last, which treats of Lodowick Muggleton, belongs to the seventeenth century; all the others are devoted to the Middle Ages, and especially to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The account given here of the ravages and the effects of the Black Death, perhaps the most eventful pestilence in history, is no doubt the most careful study to which this event has been submitted in its details, and deserves to be read in connection with Mr. Rogers's discussion of its results, with which Dr. Jessopp's view does not agree in all particulars. To us the most attractive paper in the series is the second, which was read as a lecture in an East Anglian village, describing the life in a neighboring village in the thirteenth century, the fruits of rummaging in some boxes in Rougham Hall, containing "a complete apparatus for the history of the parish of Rougham from the time of Henry the Third to the present day—so complete that it would be difficult to find in England a collection of documents to compare with it" (p. 53). The conclusion drawn from the study of these documents is:

"The people who lived in this village six hundred years ago were living a life hugely below the level of yours. They were more wretched in their poverty; they were incomparably less prosperous in their prosperity; they were worse clad, worse fed, worse housed, worse taught, worse tended, worse governed; they were sufferers from loathsome diseases which you know nothing of; the very beasts in the field were dwarfed and stunted in their growth, and I do not believe there were any giants on the earth in those days. The death-rate among the children must have been tremendous. The disregard of human life was so callous that we can hardly conceive it. There was everything to harden, nothing to soften; everywhere oppression, greed, and fierceness. Judged by our moral standards, the people of our country village were beyond all doubt coarser, more brutal, and more wicked than they are" (p. 112).

But Dr. Jessopp's impressions are not wholly unfavorable. If village life was lower than we have been taught to believe, on the other hand, monastic life he believes to have been higher. "As a body, the monks of the thirteenth century were better than their age. Vicious and profligate, drunken and unchaste, as a class, they certainly were not. . . . On the other hand, the intense *esprit de corps* of a convent of monks went beyond anything that we can now realize, and led to grave sins against truth and honesty. The forgeries of charters, bulls, and legal instruments of all kinds for the glorification of its members was at least condoned only too frequently" (p. 160). The brief estimate which follows of the functions of the monastery in that age, from a social point of view, and the comparison with the modern club, which answers somewhat to the same needs, is interesting and ingenious. "Our modern monks look out at the windows of the Carlton and the Athenæum with no suspicion that they are at all like the monks of old. Nor are they. They lack the old faith, the old loyalty to their order, and, with the old picturesqueness, something else that we can less afford to miss—the old enthusiasm."

In the introduction to the lecture on village life, we read (p. 55): "They who are acquainted with Mr. Rogers's 'History of Prices' will observe that I have ventured to put forward views, on more points than one, very different from those which he advocates. Of the value of Mr. Rogers's compilation, and of the statistics which he has tabulated, there can be but one opinion. It is when we come to draw our inferences from such returns as these, and bring to bear upon them the side lights which further evidence affords, that differences of opinion arise among inquirers." One of these differences, we suppose, is in the judgment just passed upon village life in the Middle Ages: Mr. Rogers deduces his conclusions chiefly from figures—in these papers we get the side lights. Of his questioning some of Mr. Rogers's conclusions as to the effects of the Black Death we have already spoken.

Some of Dr. Jessopp's incidental observations are worth quoting: "St. Francis saw, and saw much more clearly than even we of the nineteenth century see it, that the parochial system is admirable, is a perfect system for the village; that it is unsuited for the town; that in the towns the attempt to work it had ended in a miserable and scandalous failure" (p. 47). "We are in the habit of saying, 'Those old monks knew how to build: look at their work, see how it stands!' But we are very much mistaken if we suppose that in the twelfth or the thirteenth or the fourteenth century there was no bad building. On the contrary, nothing is more common in the monastic annals than the notices of how this or that tower fell down, and how this or that choir was falling into ruins, and how this or that abbot got into debt by his mania for building" (p. 122).

The book is clearly and handsomely printed, but the proof-reading has not been done altogether well.

Cartas Americanas. Por Don Juan Valera. Primera Serie. Madrid: Fuentes y Capdeville; New York: *Las Novedades* Co. 1889. Pp. xii, 278.

NOVELS leap the barriers of foreign languages more easily than other forms of literature, and it is as a novelist that Valera is best known to English readers. His critical work, however, is probably what brings him more repute in Spain, where he is regarded as certainly the leading critic of his day and country, and as perhaps the best exponent of that modern intellectual movement in Spain which, while aiming at the broadest culture, and drinking deep of the spirit of the present, seeks to free the national literature from the reproach of being purely imitative, and to contribute something original and purely Spanish to the world's literary production. Valera's critical writings, at any rate, have reached a considerable bulk, numbering three volumes of 'Estudios Críticos,' two volumes of 'Disertaciones y Juicios Literarios,' one volume of 'Nuevos Estudios Críticos,' besides his 'Apuntes sobre el Nuevo Arte de escribir Novelas.' After the fashion of Sainte-Beuve's *Causeries du Lundi*, Valera has been for some time in the habit of printing literary and critical articles in the Monday issue of *El Imparcial*, and this last volume of his is made up of letters on Spanish-American literature published in the course of 1888.

The subject possesses great novelty even in Spain; it is on that ground that Valera justifies himself in publishing a work on it which is, he confesses, "ligerísimo." Rarely, he says, does a refluent tide bear back to Spain literary drift from her ancient colonies. Spanish publishing-houses find their best customers in Spanish America; but the trade is not reciprocal, and the books of Spanish-American authors seldom find their way to the mother country except as presentation copies or volumes in search of a review in the leading critical journals. The writings which Valera here discusses almost all came to him in one of those ways, and he continually laments his lack of a wider acquaintance with modern Spanish-American literature, about which he should not dare to write, he says, except with the object of "giving a moment's entertainment, if I can, and making public a little knowledge of which many honest folk are ignorant, and which they would not disdain to have brought to their notice."

The book opens with a dedicatory epistle to Cánovas del Castillo, which consists of an admirable sketch of the political and literary relations of Spain with the Spanish-American countries, before and since their independence. Political rupture came very near resulting in mental divorce, Valera thinks, owing to Spain's grudging and tardy recognition of Spanish-American independence, and to her various ambitious projects and wars for the recovery of her American prestige. During all this period of separation and growing jealousy, and even hate, was the opportunity of English culture to stamp itself upon the Spanish-American mind with a power equal to that with which English political ideas were lodged there. "If English culture had been more communicative, it would have penetrated the Spanish-American republics; but it is not communicative, and its influence was scarcely felt. That of France, on the contrary, given to invasion as it is, was powerfully exercised, and informed the intellectual movement, while stimulating the progress of Spanish America." This seems to us to be something of an exaggeration, in regard to the dearth of English influence, and not altogether a full account of the derivation of French influence, in South America. It would be hard to name a writer who has fecundated the best minds of South America more than Mill, and the influence of English poetry on the Spanish-American muse Valera himself more than once points out. It may well be doubted, too, if the predominance of French literature in Spanish America has been much more than a reflex of the state of things in Spain, where, as is well known, it fixed every literary fashion for years with a tyranny from which escape has yet been by no means made. So far from meaning hatred of Spain and the deliberate choice of a foreign literature, it may have meant only the continuance of the colonial custom of taking the tone slavishly from the mother country.

It is upon another opinion expressed in the dedicatory letter, however, that the American reader will fix his attention with the greatest interest, if not amazement. "In the natural and exact sciences," says this first critic of Spain, "and in industry and commerce, English America, independent first, has flourished most; but in letters, it may be said without boasting, both in quantity and in quality, Spanish America is superior to English America." Either this is so immense a mistake as to be ridiculous, or there are treasures of Spanish-American literature of which most of us have had no hint. There may be some truth in each of these suppositions. Certainly Valera is a man with a reputation to lose, and would not recklessly throw it away in wild assertions. If he does not display a profound acquaintance with our literature, he at least shows that he knows it as well as most of us know the writers of Spanish America. If it is a question of ignorance on one side or the other, the chances are that it lies with us more than with him. At any rate, he should not be condemned unheard, and in this book he makes a beginning in setting forth the evidence for the Spanish-American side of the comparison.

In "quantity" we may as well "acknowledge the corn." Mexico had printing-presses and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

books by native authors, and an Academy, long before the Pilgrims landed. While we were still at our witch-burning stage, Chili was laying the foundations of a native dramatic literature. To come down to our own days, the 'Parnaso Colombiano,' published in 1886-87, contains extracts from the writings of more than a hundred poets who have flourished in the United States of Colombia during the past seventy years, besides sixteen poetesses. Well may Valera affirm, "Spanish America is very far from being intellectually barren." Turn to his account (p. 65) of the intellectual ferment now at work in Buenos Ayres, keeping pace with the city's wonderful material expansion, read his lists of names of Argentine historians and economists, archæologists and anthropologists, jurists and writers on international law, and we shall at least see that he is not speaking at random.

As to "quality," this book itself will greatly help to reassure us. Valera writes about the best Spanish-American literature that has fallen under his observation, especially about the best Spanish-American poetry. It is in lyrical and narrative poetry, he remarks, that the genius of Spanish America is most clearly seen to be Spanish in origin. Many long extracts from the leading poets find a place in his pages, on which he bestows much praise and much severe censure. It is not always easy to follow him in his admiration. This might easily be due to a lack of appreciation of the genius of Spanish poetry, and very likely is; but at least his criticisms hit off exactly an American's idea of the great and glaring faults of Spanish-American poetry, even at its best. He admits that it may be fairly charged with "exuberance." What he means by this appears in his remarks on Andrade, where he speaks of those poets who "escriben sin arte y allá corren desbocados, dando rienda suelta á su portentosa facilidad." And concerning that poetry which he praises most highly—the Colombian—he makes a remark which will go far towards restoring our complacence, saying: "En la poesía colombiana, en la más original, en la más castiza, en la más español, hay un vago perfume, un dejo sabroso de poesía inglesa, que yo celebro, por que le da un gusto verdadera y naturalmente sentimental y le conviene muy bien, refrenando la propensión á lo redundante y á lo hueco."

Perhaps enough has been said to indicate the nature and value of the book. If it is followed up, as Valera promises, with other volumes on the same subject, the result will be to bring into at least all the prominence it deserves a literature which, if it is unknown in Spain, is almost undreamed of here. The book makes very delightful reading. Many of the author's critical passages—as where he discusses the true function of descriptive poetry, or writes of the various sorts of "Prometheus" poems—are of the highest order. His range is large and his humor enjoyable. The 'Letters' are conceived in the most leisurely vein, and leave room for frequent excursions, such as, for example, remarks on the reading habits of Spaniards, and on female education in Spain, which fall out decidedly to the reader's pleasure.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Annual Register, for the Year 1888. London: Rivingtons. 18 shillings.
Boldrewood, R. Robbery under Arms. Macmillan & Co. $1.25.
Braitmaier, F. Geschichte der Poetischen Theorie und Kritik von den Diskursen der Maler bis auf Lessing. Frauenfeld: J. Huber.
Brandes, G. Impressions of Russia. T. Y. Crowell & Co.
Breymann, Prof. H., and Wagner, Prof. A. Marlowe's Werke: Historisch-kritische Ausgabe. Faustus. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger.
Brush, Christine C. Inside Our Gate. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.
Campbell, Rev. W. An Account of Missionary Success in the Island of Formosa, published in London in 1650. 2 vols. London: Trübner & Co.
Clayden, P. W. Rogers and His Contemporaries. 2 vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co.
Crane, Prof. T. F. La Société Française au 17e siècle. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.50.
Cushing, W. Anonyms: A Dictionary of Revealed Authorship. A to Eng. Cambridge, Mass.: The Author.
Deane, Rev. W. J. David: His Life and Times. A. D. F. Randolph & Co. $1.
Dinnerology: Our Experiments in Diet. Belford, Clarke & Co. 50 cents.
Doyle, A. C. Micah Clarke: A Novel. Harper & Bros. 45 cents.
Drage, G. Cyril: A Romantic Novel. 3d ed. London: W. H. Allen & Co.
Elliott, H. Adam Kent's Choice. A. L. Burt. 25 cents.
Ford, W. C. The Writings of George Washington. Vol. II. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Fraser, G. S. In Three Cities and a State or Two: Tales. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 75 cents.
Freytag, G. Die Journalisten: Lustspiel in vier Acten. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 55 cents.
Gepp, C. G., and Haigh, A. E. Latin-English Dictionary. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.40.
Grove, G. Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Vol. IV. and last, with appendix. Macmillan & Co. $6.
Harris, F. McC. Plain Talks with Young Home Makers. Cassell & Co. 40 cents.
Helps, A. Essays Written in the Intervals of Business. Macmillan & Co. 60 cents.
Henry, C. Cercle Chromatique. Paris: Chas. Verdin.
Henry, C. Rapporteur Esthétique. Paris: G. Séguin.
Kalakaua. The Legends and Myths of Hawaii. Chas. L. Webster & Co.
Kenyon, Ellen E. The Coming School. Cassell & Co. 50 cents.
King, Capt. C. Between the Lines: A Story of the War. Harper & Bros.
Leahy, W. A. The Siege of Syracuse: A Poetical Drama in five acts. Boston: D. Lothrop Co.
Lillie, Lucy C. Roslyn's Trust. A. L. Burt. 25 cents.
Lindau, P. Lace: A Berlin Romance. D. Appleton & Co. 75 cents.
Loewy, B. Graduated Course of Natural Science, First Year. Macmillan & Co. 60 cents.
Lyall, Edna. Derrick Vaughan, Novelist. D. Appleton & Co. 25 cents.
Mahaffy, Prof. J. P., and Bernard, J. H. Kant's Critical Philosophy for English Readers. New ed. Vol. I. Macmillan & Co. $1.75.
Molesworth, Mrs. French Life in Letters. Macmillan & Co. 40 cents.
Moulton, Louise C. Miss Eyre from Boston, and Others. Boston: Roberts Bros. $1.25.
Paul, Prof. H. Principles of the History of Language. Macmillan & Co. $3.
Salter, W. M. Ethical Religion. Boston: Roberts Bros.

JUST READY.

Remsen's Chemistry.

INORGANIC CHEMISTRY. By Ira Remsen, Professor of Chemistry in Johns Hopkins University. 8vo, 827 pp (American Science Series Advanced Course). Teachers' price, $2.80; by mail, $3.08.

HENRY HOLT & Co., New York.

DAVID G. FRANCIS,
17 ASTOR PLACE, NEW YORK,
DEALER IN VALUABLE OLD AND NEW
BOOKS.
Priced Catalogues issued from time to time, sent gratis to any address.

WANTED.
$100,000
In sums of $500 and upward, to loan on improved Denver real estate, at
8 PER CENT.
PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST GUARANTEED.
Denver real estate nets an average of 25 PER CENT. per annum. Maps and information free.
Refer to Union Bank, German National Bank, State National Bank of Denver, Col., Chemical National Bank, and National Park Bank of New York.
MOORE & ERMERINS,
1626 Champa St., Denver, Col.,
239 Broadway, New York.

DO YOU READ YOUR BIBLE with a copy of A. Schultze's (Pres't Moravian Theolog. Sem'y) THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE ANALYZED? Just published. Send 20c. at once for it. THE BOOK ANTIQUARY, Easton, Pa.

JULY ATLANTIC
Has Serial and Short Stories and Essays, by
SARAH ORNE JEWETT,
Going to Shrewsbury.
One of Miss Jewett's delightful stories.
AGNES REPPLIER,
Books that have Hindered Me.
HARRIET WATERS PRESTON,
Assum Igitur.
A noble paper on Cicero's last days.
PROFESSOR N. S. SHALER,
The Problem of Discipline in Higher Education.
HENRY LOOMIS NELSON,
The Speaker's Power.
With additional chapters of Mr. Bynner's and Mr. James's Serials, and other papers of great interest.
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO.,
BOSTON.
11 East Seventeenth Street, New York.

JUST READY.
THE WORLD'S BEST BOOKS. A Key to the Treasures of Literature. By Frank Parsons, F. E. Crawford, and H. T. Richardson. 12mo, cloth, $1.25.
BURNS CONCORDANCE. A Complete Word and Phrase Concordance to the Poems and Songs of Robert Burns, incorporating a Glossary of Scotch Words, with Notes, Index, and Appendix of Readings. Compiled and edited by J. B. Reid. Royal 8vo, cloth, $8.50 net.
LITTLE, BROWN & Co., Publishers,
254 Washington Street, Boston.

HOLLAND TRUST CO.,
NO. 7 WALL ST., NEW YORK.
CAPITAL, $500,000. - - - SURPLUS, $560,213.
CORRESPONDENTS:
TWENTSCHE BANKVEREENIGING, AMSTERDAM, HOLLAND.
B. W. BLYDENSTEIN & CO., LONDON, ENGLAND.
Allows interest on deposits and interest on balances of active accounts of merchants and others.
Transacts a general banking business.
Lends money on promissory note with New York or Brooklyn appraised real estate first mortgage, with title guarantee policy as collateral security.
Acts as Executor, Trustee, and Guardian under wills for the fixed statutory charges; also, as registrar, trustee, transfer and financial agent for States, cities, railroads, towns, and other corporations, and for real-estate mortgages with coupon bonds in New York, Brooklyn, and elsewhere. Collects rents, coupons, and dividends.
Negotiates State, city, railway, and corporate loans.
TRUSTEES.

Garret A. Van Allen,	John D. Vermeule,
Warner Van Norden,	John Van Voorhis,
Hooper C. Van Voorst,	W. W. Van Voorhis,
James B. Van Woert,	Geo. W. Van Siclen,
G. Van Nostrand,	James Roosevelt,
John R. Planten,	Augustus Van Wyck,
Henry W. Bookstaver,	J. W. Vanderhorst Kuyt,
Robert B. Roosevelt,	Henry W. O. Edye,
Geo. M. Van Hoesen,	Jotham Goodnow,
Wm. Dowd,	George F Hodgman,
William Remsen,	Peter Wyckoff,
W. D. Van Vleck,	Daniel A. Heald.

ROBERT B. ROOSEVELT, President,
JOHN D. VERMEULE, Vice-President.
GEO. W. VAN SICLEN, Secretary.

Bishop, Gorham & Van Kleeck
EDWARD F. BISHOP, AUSTIN G. GORHAM, HENRY VAN KLEECK. } *DENVER, COLO.*
INVESTMENTS AND LOANS.
Money loaned, interest collected, investments made and taken care of for Eastern investors in Colorado and the West.
References: Robert M. Morse, Jr., and Edward C. Perkins, Boston; James M. McLean, Pres. Man. Life Ins. Co., Amos Cotting, New York, and the banks of Denver.

Letters of Credit.
We buy and sell Bills of Exchange on and make cable transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies, also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travelling credits, available in all parts of the world.
Brown Brothers & Co, Bankers,
NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

3854 CARLSRUHE
LICENSED TO NYPL
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED